DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

LITTLE JENNINGS AND FIGHTING DICK TALBOT

Richard Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnell.

From a photo by Emery Walker
after a painting in the National Portrait Gallery
attributed to Hyacinthe Rigaud.

LITTLE JENNINGS AND FIGHTING DICK TALBOT

A Life of the Duke and Duchess of :: :: :: Tyrconnel. :: :: ::

By PHILIP W. SERGEANT

With Seventeen Illustrations, including Two Photogravure Frontispieces

VOL. II.

London: HUTCHINSON & CO.
Paternoster Row :: :: :: 1913

B
T981s 2

HISTORY DEPARTMENT

101774

S. F. PUBLIC LIBRARY

3 1223 00917 9335

CONTENTS

PART IV

TEN YEARS TOGETHER—*continued*

CHAP.		PAGE
V.	TYRCONNEL'S VICTORY	339
VI.	THE LORD DEPUTY	353
VII.	THE APPROACH OF THE REVOLUTION	373
VIII.	CRAB-TREE CUDGEL AGAINST HOLLOW CANE	388
IX.	TYRCONNEL RECEIVES HIS KING	411
X.	DISSENSIONS AT HEADQUARTERS	431
XI.	TYRCONNEL DEFEATS HIS OPPONENTS	458
XII.	THE BEGINNING OF THE END	482
XIII.	THE BOYNE AND THE RETREAT TO LIMERICK	492
XIV.	PLOTS AND CHARGES	508
XV.	TYRCONNEL GOES TO FRANCE	522
XVI.	THE LAST STAND OF TYRCONNEL	536

PART V

CONCLUSION

I.	THE WIDOWED DUCHESS	567
II.	THE DESCENDANTS OF RICHARD AND FRANCES	585
	NOTES	593
	APPENDICES	641
	GENEALOGICAL TABLE	*Facing page* 660
	INDEX	661

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

RICHARD TALBOT, DUKE OF TYRCONNEL (*Photogravure*) *Frontispiece*

From a photograph, by Emery Walker, of the painting attributed to Hyacinthe Rigaud in the National Portrait Gallery, London.

To Face Page

HENRY HYDE, SECOND EARL OF CLARENDON . . . 348

From an engraving by Harding, after a painting by Sir Peter Lely.

FATHER EDWARD PETRE 376

From a contemporary engraving.

FRANCES JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL . . 402

From an engraving by Cheeseman, after the painting by Verelst in Lord Beaulieu's collection.

COUNT ANTHONY HAMILTON 440

From a photograph, by Emery Walker, of the painting in the National Portrait Gallery, London.

MARY, QUEEN OF JAMES II. 476

From a mezzotint by Beckett, after a painting by N. de Largillière.

LOUIS XIV. 526

From a contemporary engraving.

RICHARD TALBOT, DUKE OF TYRCONNEL . . . 562

From an engraving by Gardiner, after the painting in Lord Beaulieu's collection.

"Little Jennings and Fighting Dick Talbot"

VOL. II

PART IV.—*continued*

CHAPTER V

TYRCONNEL'S VICTORY

ON his way to London Tyrconnel made a stay of a day or two at Chester to view some military stores waiting there for transhipment to Ireland. As he was commander-in-chief of the Irish army, with a commission independent of the Lord-Lieutenant, he was perfectly within his rights in so doing. But Clarendon was irritated by his action to the extent of some rather foolish interference with the stores, of which legitimate complaint was made later.* Having

* He first sent an agent over to Chester to ship some arms during Tyrconnel's absence, whereon a letter came from the Ordnance Officer in London to the Governor of Chester, forbidding him to deliver up the arms until further notice. They were accordingly brought back from the ship—"which may be well, and for the King's service for ought I know," writes Clarendon to Rochester (letter of October 2nd, 1686). Then when he quitted Dublin for England he carried off with him the books relating to the stores, "with design," Tyrconnel supposes in a letter to Lord Dartmouth, "to leave me in the dark." Tyrconnel sent for the books, but Clarendon answered that he took it for granted that they were for himself, and not for public use, and would only deliver them into Dartmouth's hands (*Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports, XI., Dartmouth MSS.*, letter of April 8th, 1687).

finished his inspection, Tyrconnel proceeded t
London.

The surmises of Dublin with regard to the objec
of Tyrconnel's journey to England in the company c
Nagle were well founded. Indeed, as we may see fron
the Clarendon-Rochester correspondence, he took littl
pains, except when he was in the presence of Clarendon
to conceal that he was working for the Lord-Lieu
tenancy of Ireland and the reversal of the Acts o
Settlement. The Lord-Lieutenancy had been pro
mised him by Sunderland, but eighteen months ha
passed since the King had come to the throne an
still he had only an inferior post. As for the Act
of Settlement, the King had several times assure
Clarendon, and allowed Clarendon to assure th
colonists, that they would be maintained. The mor
solid among the English Roman Catholics, heade
by Lord Powis, were known to be strongly opposed t
the disturbance of the Settlement, on grounds o
policy. The same people were also averse, on the
same grounds, from the appointment of so extreme a
professor of their faith as Tyrconnel to the governmen
of Ireland. It was necessary to defeat the moderate
Roman Catholics if what was desired by Tyrconnel
was to be effected. Rochester having become a cipher
it was now only the influence of Powis and those who
thought with him which restrained the King and kep
him out of the hands of rasher advisers.

Tyrconnel found changes at Whitehall since his las

visit, though of course he was well informed of what had taken place during his absence. James had in July appointed five Roman Catholics to the Privy Council. Against three little exception could be taken, Powis, Arundel and Bellasyse having advanced far in life without giving any real cause of offence to their religious opponents. Even the former Harry Jermyn was unobjectionable politically. The fifth appointment, however, James did not venture to make public until November, 1687, the leading Roman Catholics and the Queen herself begging him not to commit such a folly. But Father Petre, if not yet publicly a Privy Councillor, was a member of another body, which had no official existence, yet in a short time was far more influential than the Council. The secret committee of Roman Catholics, according to James's own *Memoirs*, was composed of Arundel, Bellasyse, Dover, Castlemaine and Petre, while Sunderland, "being inclined to it, drew by degree all business to it, and he himself was the umpire of all."

With three members of this cabal Tyrconnel had entered into the great compact at the beginning of the reign for their joint advancement. Dover had early received his share of the spoils. Castlemaine's embassy to Rome, it was hoped, would procure Petre his cardinal's hat. Sunderland had himself laid the train for the destruction of Rochester which must precede his own acquisition of the Treasurership. Tyrconnel now claimed his portion. The King's

Memoirs state that he had sent a "Mr. ——" (whos identity is not revealed, though he is said to have stoo very well with both Sunderland and Tyrconnel) t expostulate with Sunderland on the delay of wha was promised by him, and threatened, if it was no done soon, to inform the King of all. This messag must have been sent while Tyrconnel was still in Ire land. Possibly the express out of England, whic Clarendon reports to have so much angered Tyrconn just before his departure, brought a temporising repl to his expostulations. But when the "huffing great man" appeared in person at Whitehall he quickl forced Sunderland's hand.

Lord Macaulay's account of how Tyrconnel "fawned bullied and bribed" himself into the governorshi of Ireland is confessedly based on the Sheridan Manu script among the Stuart Papers at Windsor Castl Of this "wicked cheating man," as Clarendon cal Sheridan, we shall hear more very soon. As after h dismissal by Tyrconnel for dishonesty he became h bitterest and most unscrupulous enemy, it is only fa to demand some other evidence besides his befor accepting his statement of a case.

Rumour began to be very busy in October wit regard to the coming change of Lord-Lieutenant and Tyrconnel's admission to the English Privy Counc on the eighth of the month must have seemed ver ominous to those that feared him. But it was no only Tyrconnel whom rumour named as Clarendon

probable successor. Among those suggested were Powis, Dover, Bellasyse and "Fitzjames." The last was James, the elder of the two sons of the King by Arabella Churchill, whose introduction to Court with his brother Henry the previous year had caused so much chagrin to Queen Mary. It was reported that he was to be created Duke of Dublin and sent over to Ireland as Viceroy. But the Queen's opposition to the exaltation of her husband's illegitimate offspring was powerful enough to prevent this. Whether the other alleged candidates were anxious to proceed to Ireland is doubtful. Powis and Bellasyse were both old, and the perils of exile in Dublin for a courtier were well known. Perhaps even their conviction of the desirability of keeping the post out of the hands of an extremist like Tyrconnel was insufficient to make them willing to sacrifice themselves. In Dublin it was thought that the choice lay between Dover and Tyrconnel; and by the beginning of November it was understood that Tyrconnel's chances were only threatened by the continued opposition of the leading English Roman Catholic lords. Major-General MacCarty, who was in temporary command of the Irish army, confidently offered to lay five hundred to one that in the following March Tyrconnel would be governor.

Clarendon was prepared for the worst. He felt that the King had been effectually influenced against him, and he was unfortunate enough to have offended the Queen, though we do not know how. To his brother

he complains of underhand dealings against him b MacCarty, Richard Hamilton and Sir Thomas New comen. Hamilton had obtained leave from him t go away from Ireland in October, on the plea of illness He was unwilling to believe that the young man ha been ungrateful,* but a letter from Rochester mad the case look bad against him and MacCarty. O December 8th Clarendon writes back to Rocheste describing a visit to him from the Major-Genera on the previous night. MacCarty came privately an asked the Lord-Lieutenant to let him hear the par of Rochester's letter relating to himself. "Lord, said he, "if Dick Hamilton has shewed all my lette he has made brave work; for I writ a great deal of stu in that letter concerning Madam Mazarine and othe people. Besides, my Lord, if I had written anythin as a complaint, I would have done it to my superiou and not to an inferiour, as Hamilton is; and not wit such an expression as 'by the living God' in m letter." MacCarty proceeded to assure Clarendo that he had written again to England setting all righ and saying that he was mistaken in what he had sai in his letter to Hamilton.

* In a letter to Rochester on December 30th, 1686, Clarendon says: "F Colonel Hamilton, I have all the respect imaginable for him upon the accoun of his relations: his father and some of his brothers loved me well." It seer that Anthony was Clarendon's favourite. In a letter of June 1st he te Rochester that he believes him to be "the best of that sort"—Irish arm officers apparently—and on July 11th he wrote to Sunderland recommendi him for a colonelcy and for appointment to the Irish Privy Council. Antho Hamilton was not an admirer of Tyrconnel, which naturally attract Clarendon's sympathy to him.

It is of course impossible to follow the course of such tortuous intrigues with only the very small portion of the evidence before us which survives in the Clarendon correspondence. It seems clear, however, that in order to persuade King James to get rid of Clarendon some of the leading Irish army officers did lend themselves to a scheme to misrepresent him, or at least to make accusations against him which he had no opportunity of meeting. That this was discreditable alike to them and to their chief cannot be denied, and our sympathy must be with the injured man, however weak and ineffectual he was. Therefore it is useless to attempt to defend Tyrconnel's methods of obtaining the post which he coveted. In his whole-hearted devotion to the object of his life he was troubled with little scruple as to the means whereby he removed obstacles. To those who pretended that self-enrichment was his sole object it was possible to deduce particular baseness from this. But if it was a fact, as it must appear to the unprejudiced student of his career, that from the age of thirty at least he kept one great end constantly in view which cannot be called selfish, and that for it he risked both life and fortune more than once, then at least there is some palliation, if an inadequate one, for his carelessness as to his methods.

Before the end of 1686 he made sure of the post which was to enable him to put into practice his designs in Ireland. He seems to have felt confident of his success before November closed, if we may judge from

a letter sent by an unknown correspondent to John Ellis, Secretary of the Revenue in Ireland. This letter, dated November 30th, says: "The Jesuit Jack Peters is very great and Tyr[connel] works by him. This High Priest has the lodgings in Whitehall which were the King's while Duke. Tyr[connel] makes all the visible preparations for the chief government of your kingdom, as coaches, plate, beds, &c., and Tho. Sheridan his chief secretary. This is the public vogue, but no other signs, no declaration in Council . . ."

Under the disguise of "Jack Peters" Father Edward Petre is to be recognised, and we have here no doubt the true suggestion as to how Tyrconnel managed to break down the opposition to his appointment among the English Roman Catholics. Petre was one day to be summed up by King James as "a plausible, but a weak man, abounding in words." But at this time he had managed to secure a powerful hold over his master. "Father Piters the Jesuit has the most credit," writes Barillon to Louis. "My Lord Arundel, my Lord Tyrconnel, my Lord Dover are in frequent consultation with my Lord Sunderland," he adds, "and the direction of principal affairs is with them." The influence of this inner cabal among the Roman Catholics, combined with his regard for his former Gentleman of the Bedchamber,* overcame James's inclination to

* Rumours of an alteration of this regard were unfounded. "After all the discourse that hath been of the Lord Tyrconnel's being out of favour," writes Narcissus Luttrell towards the end of November, "the contrary now appears."

listen to the representations of the older Roman Catholic lords. Tyrconnel's journey to Whitehall was crowned with victory. It is true that as far as the repeal of the Acts of Settlement was concerned he met with a disappointment, for James was as firmly convinced as Powis and his friends that this would be a fatal step to him in England; and Nagle's arguments (which may be seen in his "Coventry Letter" to Tyrconnel) were all in vain. But James consented to a change in the viceroyalty of Ireland, the only stipulation made being that Tyrconnel should be called Lord Deputy, a title which seemed to imply a more temporary appointment than that of Lord-Lieutenant.

The prelude to the fall of Clarendon was Rochester's, which Sunderland had so long been engineering. The Hydes stood together, and it was scarcely possible to get rid of one while retaining the other. James exhibited considerable reluctance at parting with the Lord Treasurer, in spite of the campaign of misrepresentation which had been waged against him for so many months, and it was only by working on his religious susceptibilities that his unscrupulous advisers prevailed on him to take the irrevocable step. Rochester was pictured to him as a possible convert to Roman Catholicism, and his vexation at Rochester's refusal to leave the Anglican Church produced in him what he himself calls "urgent heats and displeasure." In this state he deprived him of his office; but at the same time he gave him a handsome pension. This

pension and that granted to Clarendon soon after coupled with the fact that he refused to create either a new Treasurer or a new Lord-Lieutenant, may be taken as signs of James's desire to soften the force of the blow to the two Hydes.

Rochester's dismissal was gazetted on January 7th, 1687. On the following day Clarendon in Dublin received a letter from Sunderland, announcing the King's pleasure that he should give up his post and leave Ireland within one week of Tyrconnel's arrival. He writes sadly to his brother: "I am of opinion His Lordship, if he had so thought fit, might have given me longer warning; but it may be it is decreed I am to be worse used than ever any man was before me." "Mortification is no stranger to me," he enters on the same day in the *Diary* which he had begun to keep on the first of the year.

As though to provide a little excitement for the last days of his government in Ireland, on January 21st the Provost of Trinity College came to Clarendon "in some trouble, having met with a report of a plot being discovered, as if some of the students had a design to murder my Lord Tyrconnel when he came." The *Diary* continues: "He desired to know if I had any account of it. I told him, no truly; and that I could not but laugh to see the little arts that are used to draw the poor English of all ranks into plots. However, I advised him to take some discreet person with him, and to go and speak with Judge Nugent in the

From an engraving by Harding, after the painting by Lely.

HENRY HYDE, SECOND EARL OF CLARENDON.

matter." Thomas Nugent, second son of the Earl of Westmeath whom Cromwell had in 1652 excepted from pardon for life and estate, was a man rapidly coming to the front, and had recently been appointed a Justice of the King's Bench. He showed his common-sense on this occasion by pronouncing the matter (of which he had already been informed) "very frivolous" and "a very ridiculous thing"; and so we hear no more of the plot.

In the meantime Tyrconnel had started from London on January 11th. The first stage of his journey was not devoid of incident. An amusing letter to John Ellis, dated January 15th, mentions a report in London that he or his servants had been robbed. "He went privately hence to avoyd the winged Crowd of his Countrymen that usually follow their friends (like that other Cohors, some a-foot some a-hors) as ffarr as St. Albans for a good dinner." Apparently, in avoiding his countrymen, Tyrconnel fell into worse hands. However, he reached Chester on the 17th, Holyhead on the 22nd. At Holyhead he was detained so long by contrary winds that it was not until February 6th that he made his appearance in Dublin. This was a Sunday and a festival in memory of the King's accession, and the Lord-Lieutenant was at church. "Towards the end of the sermon there was a rumour about the church that the yacht was in the bay; and it proved to be so, for Lord Tyrconnel came to town about 2 of the clock in the afternoon." About four

Secretary Sheridan, accompanied by Judge Nugent, arrived at the Castle. "He said he was sent by my Lord Tyrconnel to make his excuse that he could not come to me to-day, by reason of his being very weary; but that he would not fail to be with me to-morrow morning. He added that my Lord had commanded him, to the end that no time might be lost, to give me the King's letter, which I took; and holding it in my hand, asking him some ordinary questions of their voyage, &c., he desired me to read the letter; because possibly my Lord Tyrconnel might expect some answer. I then read it, and bid him present my humble service to my Lord and tell him I would take care to dispatch the King's commands. . . . The King's letter was to direct me to deliver the sword to my Lord Tyrconnel within a week after his arrival; as my Lord Sunderland had before informed me I was to do."

Clarendon only records two meetings with his successor before he left; for on February 8th the *Diary* abruptly breaks off for the remainder of the year. On the 7th Tyrconnel paid his visit to Dublin Castle, bringing with him Sir Alexander Fitton, the newly-appointed Lord Chancellor, to introduce him. The conversation was purely informal, concerning the voyage from England and so on. The next day Clarendon, in his turn, visited Tyrconnel, who was stopping at his nephew Lord Limerick's. An unwonted display of courtesy was witnessed between the two. Tyrconnel met Clarendon on the stairs and

conducted him into his room. On being informed that the sword of office should be handed over to him on the 12th, he begged him not to leave the Castle before it was convenient for him. But Clarendon said he would be ready to go upon the same day. Tyrconnel then expressed his wonder at "such alarms" upon his appointment. What Clarendon answered we do not hear, for it is at this point that the manuscript ceases.

Of the alarms which excited the new Lord Deputy's wonder, according to himself, we hear from several sources. The old Duke of Ormonde, writing to Southwell from Hampton Court on February 5th, speaks of the news expected of many and great alterations in Ireland if the wind should favour Tyrconnel's passage thither. "Some men, but more women," he adds, "are come lately thence, but I think a less matter than the dread of my Lord Tyrconnel will fright a lady from Ireland to London." Sir John Reresby, in his *Memoirs*, is more serious. He writes: "Lord Clarendon, Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, was recalled, and Mr. Talbot, a rigid Irish Papist, a little before created Earl of Tyrconnel, sent over in his room; which made so dreadful an impression upon many Protestants of that kingdom that they either left or sold their estates as they could and came over into England." Within a very short space of time after Tyrconnel's remark to Clarendon matters grew worse; for it was computed that no less than fifteen hundred families of the colonists left either with the retiring

Lord-Lieutenant or soon after him. Some of the panic-stricken endeavoured at least to secure their property. Narcissus Luttrell records how "the colledge at Dublin in Ireland haveing shipt aboard a vessel there all the plate belonging to the colledge, to transport it into England, it was stopt by order from the Lord Deputy and carried back."

Clarendon duly delivered up the sword to Tyrconnel in the presence of the Privy Council on February 12th. His speech of farewell on that occasion was full of pleasant expressions, with but one slight sting when he alluded to the feuds in Ireland.* He concluded by heartily wishing his successor joy of the honour which the King had done him. It must have cost Clarendon some effort to utter those last words.

* "The King hath placed Your Excellency in a very great station; has committed to your care the government of a great and flourishing kingdom, of a dutiful, loyal and obedient people. It is extremely to be lamented that there are such feuds and animosities among them, which I hope Your Excellency's prudence, with the assistance of so wise a Council, will disperse."

CHAPTER VI

THE LORD DEPUTY

IN the Instructions given to Tyrconnel on appointment to his post, King James had said: "We doubt not but you will pursue all prudent courses for the good government and increase of the profits of [Our Kingdom of Ireland]"; and it had been laid down very exactly on what lines he was to proceed in the various departments under his charge. Although he was directed to secure to His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects the same privileges as to the rest, there was little to which just exception could be taken by a fair-minded colonist in the text of the Instructions.* Moreover, the first public statements made after Tyrconnel entered upon his duties were of a peaceful and soothing character. Even the bigoted Luttrell

* See Appendix D for these Instructions. The part relating to "spiritual livings in the gift of the Crown" is somewhat ambiguous. It should be noted, however, that the bulk of the complaints which King makes in the *State of the Protestants* against the treatment of the Irish Church refer to what happened after the summoning of the Parliament at Dublin in 1689.

writes: "The Lord Deputy and council have published a proclamation to assure His Majesty's subjects of his care for their ease and advantage, and protection in their just rights and properties, thereby to quiet the minds of His Majesty's subjects; as also another proclamation for the preserving His Majesty's forces there in good order and discipline; and a third for the suppressing of tories and robbers." It was noted, however, by the more anxious among the settlers, that in debate at the Council-board Tyrconnel omitted to refer to the preservation of the Acts of Settlement and Explanation. This, no doubt, he did upon his own initiative, still hoping to convert the King to his views, despite the lack of encouragement which James gave him in this respect.

Of course it is not by the letter of his Instructions by which Tyrconnel's government must be judged, but by the manner in which he interpreted them; and he took the fullest possible advantage of the King's command to give the Roman Catholics in Ireland the same rights as the rest. The judicial bench and the various public offices throughout the country were soon filled with Roman Catholics, almost to the exclusion of others. The Privy Council itself was gradually changed in composition, though here prudence compelled that the process of Romanisation should be slower. Then he had been commanded that Roman Catholics should be "admitted to all the privileges and freedoms which Our other subjects enjoy in all Ports and Cor-

porations"; to which end he proceeded to demand their charters from the towns, beginning with Dublin, thereby arousing the natural conclusion that he intended, before the next Irish Parliament should be called, to pack the constituencies in the Roman interest in the same way in which they had hitherto been packed in the Protestant. Some resistance was made, but an appeal to the King was fruitless, and all the charters of the most obstinate towns, notably Londonderry, were finally wrested from them by recourse of the law courts.

To the Lord Deputy such proceedings had the appearance of a righteous restoration of power into the hands of the great majority, who had for so long oppressively been deprived of all share in the government of their country; and it was with feelings of satisfaction, we may imagine, that in August, 1687, he crossed to Chester to meet the King and give him the account of Ireland which had been prescribed in his Instructions.* James had on August 16th set out on a "progress" through the West of England, endeavouring at every place he visited to assure the inhabitants of his benevolent intentions towards them and his

* King (*State of the Protestants*) alleges that "it was the common and encouraging speech of the Earl of Tyrconnel from the very beginning of his Government, and particularly when he took leave of several Privy Councellors and Officers, at his going to wait on King James at Chester, August, 1687: 'I have put the Sword into your hands.' And then, in his usual stile, prayed God to damn them all, if ever they parted with it." King being a hater of the Lord Deputy and all his works, it would be unjust to take this description of his parting speech as authentic.

toleration in religious matters, as shown by his recent Declaration of Indulgence. Proceeding by way of Portsmouth, Bath, Gloucester and Worcester, he reached Shrewsbury on August 25th and Chester on the 27th. Tyrconnel came to him at Shrewsbury and accompanied him to Chester, where the King stopped a couple of days. No account of their meeting exists, and their conversations were no doubt carried on in strict privacy. According to Barillon, James evinced great satisfaction at the steps which his Deputy had taken, and confirmed what he had done on behalf of the Roman Catholics. But on one point we gather that Tyrconnel met with a rebuff. It would seem that he pressed on the King once more the necessity of repealing the Acts of Settlement; for the question was soon afterwards a subject of public discussion, if we may judge by some words in another letter from Barillon to Louis. "The reversal of this Settlement," writes the French Ambassador in October, "is regarded as a matter of the greatest importance, and if it can be effected without opposition will mean an entire separation of Ireland from England. *This is the general opinion of the English.*"

Tyrconnel thought to gain his object with the aid of an Irish Parliament, which might be relied on to vote the right way after his reform of the constituencies in the Roman Catholic interest. James, however, though not averse to summoning a Parliament, was obdurate with regard to the Settlement, and Tyrconnel

was obliged to return to Dublin without having made any further progress in this part of his programme.

We now come to the question whether James and Tyrconnel discussed at this period a far more comprehensive scheme with regard to the future of Ireland. The evidence, which has been accepted by Tyrconnel's enemies as conclusive, is contained in a letter from one of the agents whom Louis XIV. employed to supplement and check the work of Barillon in England. François d'Usson Bonrepos was a high official in the French Admiralty under Seignelay, to whose hands now was entrusted the principal direction of Louis's plans for securing English aid against Holland. Bonrepos's general correspondence with Seignelay does not impress one with a high idea of his sagacity or penetration. However, it is necessary to consider on its merits what he says on the present occasion. On September 4th (August 25th, according to the English calendar) he writes to his chief as follows :

" A person of quality at the Court of England, who has the entire confidence of my Lord Tyrconnel and whom he employs in all the secret affairs which he has to lay before the King his master, told me that his friend had permitted him to disclose to me his views, how, in event of the death of the King of England, he should take measures not to come under the rule of the Prince of Orange and to put himself under the protection of the King [of France]. He would have liked me to go to Chester, where my Lord Tyrconnel

was to be, to confer with him about this plan. But, as I knew from his discourse that my Lord Tyrconnel's intention was to request that the stores should be now furnished with arms, saddles and other things which he believes cannot easily be found in Ireland in case of need, I did not think fit to enter upon negotiations of this nature without an express order to that effect. I merely said that I would keep the secret, as was strongly urged on me, especially with regard to M. de Barillon, who is feared on account of my Lord Sunderland; that, if after the return from Chester there was anything more particular to tell me, I would write to you to get the King's orders; that it did not seem to me, however, that the King of England gave cause, either by his age or by the state of his health, to think of such distant measures. This same person told me that my Lord Sunderland had given my Lord Tyrconnel to understand that his design was to retire to Ireland in case of accident, but that the latter had no confidence in the other. I learnt also from the Marquis d'Albeville* that the principal anxiety of the Prince of Orange is lest Ireland shall be put in condition, before the death of the King of England, to cut herself off from his dominion when

* James's ambassador at the Hague, where he was placed by Sunderland's influence. He was an Irish Roman Catholic, originally named White, his title having been conferred on him by the Emperor. His conduct at the Hague was more than suspicious, but he followed James into Ireland and to Saint-Germain, so that it is difficult to understand what could be his motives previously in conveying false information as to Prince William's intentions, as he is accused of doing.

he shall come to the throne. I did not think fit to show more zeal for a proposal of this nature. There will always be time enough to take up again with a person who makes this kind of advance, if the King thinks proper. I am fully convinced that the intention of the King of England is to bring about the loss of this kingdom to his successor and to fortify it so that his Catholic subjects may find there an assured asylum. His plan is to put matters on this footing in the course of five years. But my Lord Tyrconnel presses him unceasingly that this may be done in less time; and in fact His Britannic Majesty has within the past eight days sent thither a vessel laden with powder, arms and mortars, at the entreaty of the person who spoke to me."

It was but natural that Louis, on being informed by Seignelay of what Bonrepos had written to him, should consider the matter one of the highest importance. But it is to be noted that he insisted that positive credentials should be obtained from Tyrconnel, and that only in that case did he order Bonrepos to convey his approval of the alleged proposal and his promise of support. The agent was commanded to take steps to open a direct correspondence with Tyrconnel, keeping it from the knowledge of Barillon, whom Louis himself evidently considered too bound up with Sunderland to be entrusted with so dangerous a secret.

Bonrepos did not succeed in obtaining the necessary credentials nor in opening the direct correspondence

with Tyrconnel. At least we seem justified in assuming this from the fact that we hear no more of the affair. Are we, then, to be more ready than was Louis to believe that Tyrconnel had authorised any such offer as that reported by the French agent? The answer depends upon the credibility of Bonrepos and the identity of "the person of quality at the Court of England." Now Bonrepos was, as we have said, not remarkable for his sagacity; and, moreover, it was incumbent on him to justify his employment outside the French Embassy staff by discovering new ways of furthering his master's interests. He was in consequence peculiarly open to the advances of those who pretended to have something to offer him, and even if his good faith was beyond suspicion (which we do not know), he could not be implicitly relied on without corroboration of his evidence. As to the person mentioned in his letter, we have unfortunately no clue, he having refrained from giving the name. Whoever it was must have been an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, and that is all that can be said about him.* Without further

* Richard Hamilton would answer to the description, and it is rather to be wondered at that no one has suggested Hamilton's name, seeing that those who hate Tyrconnel hate also his friend and lieutenant. Clarendon, on the previous December 30th, stated that when Hamilton left Dublin he "pretended that he was so very ill that he must make haste into France or he should die; but common fame (an author which gains too great credit) says that he goes into France upon other designs and to perfect the negotiations which others have begun. This is given out chiefly by his countrymen," adds Clarendon. Hamilton, therefore, was supposed to have some deep scheme in hand involving French co-operation. At the time of the Chester meeting he seems to have been in England with the newly raised Irish regiment which bore his name.

knowledge we can conclude nothing for or against his object in approaching Bonrepos.

That somebody came to Bonrepos, claiming and believed by him to have been sent by Tyrconnel, we may safely admit; and that this person suggested the aid of France to separate Ireland from England in the event of the succession of William of Orange to the English throne. But with regard to the rest of the story the only possible verdict on the existing evidence is, Not Proven. It cannot be doubted that both King James and Tyrconnel cherished the project of making Ireland into "an assured asylum" for Roman Catholics in case of danger, and particularly of danger arising from the treacherous designs of William of Orange. Were they prepared to go further and attempt to cut Ireland adrift if the crown of the Three Kingdoms legally devolved on William's wife?

There was no affectation in James's love for his two daughters, and at all times he showed himself very sensitive about suggestions of English subservience to France. It is, to say the least, extremely improbable that he should have contemplated calmly the handing over of Ireland to France, to the detriment of his daughters' inheritance. Moreover, there was no reason for him at this stage in his life to take such a gloomy view of the situation. He was as yet only in his fifty-fourth year, had a sound constitution, and cannot have abandoned all hope of legitimate male offspring to replace the child lost in 1677.

The same considerations did not weigh with Tyrconnel, except indirectly as a faithful servant of his master. But with regard to the "Nationalist" ideas imputed to him, it will be seen that two years later the chief complaint of such fervid Irishmen as Charles O'Kelly, author of *Macariæ Excidium*, was that he encouraged King James in the idea that "the only way to recover England was to lose England." It may be argued that then the case was altered, James having a son to whom to bequeath his throne. It is, of course, impossible to deny that the wild idea may sometimes have flashed through Tyrconnel's brain that, rather than leave Roman Catholic Ireland at the mercy of a Dutch Calvinist prince and his ultra-Protestant supporters in England, it would be best to arrange for her separation from the old connection under the protection of France. But that he deliberately made the offer to Louis XIV. when all was apparently going well with his master's rule is incredible.

It was not to be expected that the conference of the King and the Lord Deputy at Chester would fail to attract attention from others besides the French representatives in England, and it was considered desirable to correct the hasty surmises which were bound to be made by the nervous people of England. An obviously inspired newsletter of September 13th, 1687, gives the following information for the public benefit:

"The Lord Tyrconnel's sudden return for Ireland

was occasioned by the order he has to prepare all things towards a Parliament there, which the King would have sit the 5th of November, but if it cannot be that time it must be put off till the 25th of March, but he is rather obliged to expedite all things for the 5th of November, for he is to propose to them that all the English that have the estates of the Irish Papists in their possession shall pay them three years' rent, and in lieu of it all claim and pretension of the Irish shall be for ever void and expired, and the titles of the English be good and firm for ever by virtue of an Act of Parliament to be made for that purpose; an expedient which will free the English of all fear and danger of being violently dispossessed of those lands and estates, and will also make some small satisfaction to the Irish for their great losses, considering that they have hardly more to expect during this Government, and much less or nothing at all in case of a change. This may convince us that there is no design of introducing Popery there, much less here."

Whose was this particular scheme for rectifying the injustices of the Acts of Settlement does not appear. It is very like what Clarendon had proposed to the King the previous year. It was certainly not Tyrconnel's notion. He wished for a speedy summoning of Parliament, but for the purpose of introducing a bill of a very different character to deal with the Settlement. He still refused to give up hope of bringing James over to his views as to the necessity of

the repeal of the Acts, and early in 1688 despatched a mission over to England to argue the matter. He chose for the task Thomas Nugent, now Chief Justice of Ireland, and Chief Baron Rice. Their experience in England was unpleasant, for the London mob hooted and pelted them and their own co-religionists were very cold to them. Chiefly, however, they failed because there was no means of compelling the King to agree with them, and nothing short of compulsion could win him over. Sunderland claimed, in the *Letter to a Friend* which he published to vindicate himself early in 1689, that it was he who defeated the scheme, after refusing a bribe of £40,000. We can hardly imagine that even his new friends after the Revolution believed a tale like that.

In pressing the King so hard in the matter of the Settlement Tyrconnel almost overreached himself. The moderate Roman Catholics revived their opposition to him, and at one moment seemed to have succeeded in depriving him of James's favour. Burnet, who was a friend of neither party, may be accepted as a witness. In a note on the state of Ireland which he wrote some time in 1688, but did not incorporate in his *History of My Own Time*, he says: "The English Papists are sensible enough of Tyrconnel's brutality; and they thought to have got him to be recalled, and Powis was to go in his stead; of which he [Powis] thought himself so sure that he owned it to a friend of mine that he was to go thither."

Burnet assigns a different reason, we see, for the English Papists' complaint against the Lord Deputy, but the word "brutality" was no doubt his, not theirs. They attacked Tyrconnel, however, on various grounds. There is a curious affair, belonging to this period, which shows them to have been willing to make use of scarcely creditable means to damage him. Of Thomas Sheridan, the man whom Tyrconnel had brought over with him to Dublin at the beginning of 1687, we have heard Clarendon's opinion. That he was talented cannot be denied. Born in 1646, he was a Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin, at the age of twenty-one, and ten years later he was made an honorary D.C.L. of Oxford. He managed to gain the friendship of both Charles II. and the Duke of York, and their influence perhaps helped him to avoid a worse fate than mere imprisonment by order of the House of Commons at the instigation of Titus Oates. He claimed at that time to be a member of the English Church, as undoubtedly he was originally, like his brothers, both of whom continued in it and became, one Bishop of Cloyne, the other Bishop of Kilmore. But Thomas was probably already a Roman Catholic in 1680, and afterwards was a very extreme one. The Duke of York, becoming King, continued his favour to him and assigned him to Tyrconnel as Chief Secretary of State and Collector of the Revenue in Ireland. As a holder of the first post Sheridan was a member of the Irish Privy Council, and his name appears among

those on Tyrconnel's first proclamation. But befor long the Lord Deputy had very legitimate cause fo depriving him of his offices. The details are given b Abel Boyer in his *History of William III.*, circum stantially and with every appearance of truth.

Tyrconnel, says Boyer, began to discover tha Sheridan "sold employments of all sorts, both eccle siastical, civil, and military, and that whenever h met with an opportunity of making an advantageou bargain for a place in the custom-house, he woul pretend that 'twas upon the Lord-Lieutenant's recom mendation that such a person was employed." Com plaints went over to England of the number of thes recommendations, and an order was sent to Tyrconne not to meddle with the Customs. Tyrconnel hereo very naturally had a quarrel with Sheridan, who deter mined in revenge to ruin him. "His first stratagen to undermine him was to prepossess the Romish clerg against him; which to accomplish he contracted a intimate acquaintance with his chaplain,* who pick' up what he had observ'd of Tyrconnel's contempt o the Mass and Religion. Of this Sheridan, a bigotte Papist, gave an account to Father Petre, whose niec he had married, by which means he gain'd an interes not only with the favourite Jesuit, but likewise with a the Irish clergy, especially with the titular primat of Armagh, who had no kindness for Tyrconnel, an both together, with the before-mention'd pries

* Perhaps the Father Geoghegan of whom we hear later.

form'd articles of impeachment against the Lord-Lieutenant."

Tyrconnel got wind of the conspiracy and employed another priest, "a confident of his own," to intercept the letters against him which Sheridan was sending to England. Taking counsel with Rice and Nagle, he himself wrote to Sunderland, exposing Sheridan's corrupt practices, but not mentioning his intrigues against himself. Then he sent for Sheridan to come to him and asked him whether he had written anything against him to London. Sheridan answered, No, but he had heard that His Excellency had written against him—"which so enrag'd the Deputy (who was a man that could not contain his passion) that he call'd him Traitor, Cheat and other abusive names; and pulling out Sheridan's letter, ask'd him if that was not his hand?" Sheridan was at first greatly confused, but "after some recollection he began to justifie himself and to enter into a capitulation with the Lord Deputy; at which, Tyrconnel rising in excess of fury to kick him, Sheridan was turn'd out."

Tyrconnel, having choked down his violent but justifiable anger, agreed that Dennis Daly, Second Justice of the Common Pleas, should "take Sheridan to task and so accommodate the matter as to stifle any further noise of it." The man's influence at Court doubtless made this course prudent. But he would not rest content with what he had done. To pursue his designs against Tyrconnel, according to Boyer,

he "sollicited an order from the King for his going over, which having obtain'd and being arrived at London, he soon found by the cold reception he had from S[underlan]d that there was no expectation of removing Tyrconnel; for he was fortified with the French interest and was, in a manner, Deputy to Lewis, not James;* it being said in Paris, when news came there of Tyrconnel's being struck out, that there was none in England durst move him." He found well-wishers in Powis, Castlemaine, and others of that section of the Roman Catholics, but they did not dare to trust him with their sentiments. Before he had been more than three days in London he was followed by Lord Dongan, bringing letters from his great-uncle to Sunderland and others, setting forth Sheridan to great disadvantage. "Which negotiation," Boyer concludes, "so succeeded that even Father Petre, his wife's uncle, would admit him no longer to his presence; and soon after being return'd to Ireland, by sentence of the chief judges he was dismissed from all his employments. A just reward for his former apostacy from the Church of England."

Sheridan survived the blow. King James suffered from a singular inability to recognise a bad man when he had once befriended him. So he lived to become the King's private secretary at Saint-Germain and to

* Boyer, writing after the Revolution and with full licence to abuse Jacobites as he liked, repeats a common slander of Williamite authors against the Lord Deputy.

wrote a history of his own times, which still exists in manuscript in the Royal Library at Windsor. In this, with great satisfaction to himself, he paid off his grudge against Tyrconnel. Such is the work which Lord Macaulay thought it fair to cite as a trustworthy authority on Tyrconnel's character and conduct.

In place of Sheridan, William Ellis was appointed Chief Secretary and a Commissioner of the Revenue. William and his elder brother John were sons of a Puritan divine in Buckinghamshire, but William found no difficulty in living on good terms with Roman Catholics without going to the length of becoming a convert. Both obtained official posts in Ireland, John being secretary first to Lord Ossory and then to Lord Arran at Dublin. It was in his society that Arran, when Deputy for his father, was accused of keeping disreputable company; and as he was rumoured a lover of the Duchess of Cleveland he seems to have had an inclination in that direction. He was, however, a man of good abilities and rose through various offices to be Under-Secretary of State to William of Orange in 1695. The younger Ellis made less mark in history, but when, after some service in the Irish Revenue Department, he obtained the object of his ambition, the Chief Secretaryship to the Government, he appears to have had considerable influence with Tyrconnel in spite of their difference of faith. Retiring afterwards to Saint-Germain, he remained in the service of Queen Mary until her death.

Having successfully ridden the storms which his enemies among his own co-religionists had stirred up against him, Tyrconnel was now secure at anchor in Dublin. The ship of government was manned chiefly by his nominees and friends, including a host of his relatives or connections. On the Privy Council were his nephew and heir, Sir William Talbot; Bruno Talbot, whose precise relation to him has not been ascertained; his nephew, the Earl of Limerick; his brother-in-law, Sir Thomas Newcomen; Simon Luttrell, who had married Newcomen's eldest daughter; Nicholas Viscount Netterville, a kinsman of his mother; Viscount Rosse, his wife's son-in-law; and Anthony Hamilton, brother of his wife's first husband. The number of his kindred in the army and the various civil departments is too great to recount. But it may be mentioned that his nephew and ultimate successor in the title of Tyrconnel, William Talbot (of Haggardstown), was early a major; another nephew, Sir Neil O'Neil, a captain, as well as Lieutenant of County Armagh; and that other sons of his brothers and sisters may be identified readily in most of the branches of the Irish administration. Nepotism was certainly practised unblushingly by the Lord Deputy. But he was a member of an extraordinarily large family, and on the testimony of his enemies, when filling up posts throughout Ireland with Roman Catholics he had a difficulty in finding properly qualified men. Less objection, at least, was made against his nominees

of his own blood than against most of those, unconnected with himself, whom he put into the highest offices of State.

The greatest grievance of the "English interest" in Ireland in the matter of Tyrconnel's appointments was the way in which he packed the bench. With but one Protestant left to administer the law—John Keating, Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas—the colonists looked back mournfully on the days when not a single Roman Catholic had held a similar position. Unhappily the only method which Tyrconnel's successors could devise to show their reprobation of his policy was to imitate it, with the substitution of Protestants for Papists. And so the melancholy see-saw of oppression and revenge, which makes Irish history such painful reading, went on.

It was to the interest of those who promoted the Revolution to represent Tyrconnel's government in Ireland as peculiarly unjust. But at this distance of time we are in a position to recognise that the charge is not true. His rule was arbitrary and one-sided, but its only peculiarity in this respect was that he favoured the majority, the previous governors the minority. King in his *State of the Protestants** made out the worst possible case against the dead Lord Deputy, but he was compelled to admit, if grudgingly, the few lives lost in Ireland by Protestants in the reign of James II.

* "An history as truly as it is finely written," says Burnet. Burnet's own ideas of truth and history make this a doubtful commendation.

There was no such judicial torturing to death as occurred even during the humane Ormonde's Lord-Lieutenancy, in the case of Peter Talbot. Peter's brother did not retaliate in kind against those who had rejoiced over that crime. The "great Furioso," as a pamphleteer of 1690 called him, might often threaten death, but he did not inflict it even when his power was absolute. Only by fathering on him the outrages of the rapparees could his enemies bolster up their imputations of cruelty and butchery against him. This, of course, they did not hesitate to do.

CHAPTER VII

THE APPROACH OF THE REVOLUTION

FROM the date of her departure from Dublin with her husband at the end of August, 1686, until the same month two years later, Frances Countess of Tyrconnel is not recorded to have visited Ireland. The Earl, as we have seen, spent the period between August, 1686, and the following February with her in London. Otherwise husband and wife appear to have been separated from one another by the latter's duties in attendance on the Queen; which prevented her, for instance, from meeting him at Chester or Shrewsbury in August, 1687, when Her Majesty journeyed to Bath for the sake of her health, instead of accompanying the King on his progress west and north.

Rooms had been assigned to the Tyrconnels in London at St. James's Palace, and these Frances occupied at first in the company of her daughters of both her families. Gradually she succeeded in the

ambition of match-making mothers and married off those that were of marriageable age. The eldest went first, before King James's reign was a year old. On January 15th, 1686, Lady Russell wrote to Dr. Fitzwilliam: "Lord Talbot is come out of Ireland and brought husbands for his daughters-in-law [*i.e.*, step-daughters]; one was married on Tuesday to a Lord Rosse; the other lord is Dungan." Elizabeth Hamilton* on January 13th became the third wife of Richard Parsons, first Viscount Rosse, whose name is found soon afterwards figuring on the Privy Council of Ireland. If it was Frances, the second of the Hamiltons, who was intended for Tyrconnel's great-nephew Walter Dongan, for some unknown reason she did not marry him; for about the middle of the following year she was taken to wife by Henry, son and heir of the seventh Viscount Dillon, of Costello-Gallen. Her marriage-portion, we learn, was £3,000, being presumably provided from the estate which Tyrconnel had settled on his wife. The date of Mary Hamilton's marriage to Nicholas Barnewall, third Viscount Kingsland, is uncertain. Subsequently to Dillon succeeding his father (after his death at the battle of Aughrim) the three daughters of Frances by George Hamilton were known in Ireland as "the three Viscountesses," it is said.

* Dangeau (*Journal*, I., 228) mentions the fact of Lady Tyrconnel coming to Paris in October, 1685, to fetch "Mlle. d'Hamilton, her daughter whom she is marrying in England to Milord Ross."

After she had secured husbands for her first family there still remained with Lady Tyrconnel her little daughter by her second marriage, and possibly also her step-daughter, Charlotte. She was, therefore, at no time left alone in her home at St. James's Palace.

There are no pictures of the Court of James II. such as amuse or scandalize the student of the reign of his brother. No one supplies the place of Pepys or Gramont for the few years during which the last Stuart king sat on the throne. The correspondence of courtiers and of foreign envoys at Whitehall does not enable us to reconstruct the scenes amid which Frances passed her days as Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Mary. Not until near the end of the period do we see her playing her part on a memorable occasion in Stuart history. On the morning of Trinity Sunday, June 10th, 1688, there was born at St. James's Palace a young prince, of whose birth Evelyn truly predicted in his entry for the day that it would "cause disputes." Two days before the end of the previous year the King was assured of the justification of the Queen's expectation of another child, and at once took the public into his confidence by ordering a day of thanksgiving. Little enthusiasm had been exhibited in England when the rumours of the Queen's pregnancy first spread about, and there was no more when they were confirmed. The imprudence of James in flaunting his religion in the face of his unsympathetic subjects—as when he insisted on publicly receiving Count Ferdinando

d'Adda, against his own will and that of the Pope, as Papal nuncio at Windsor, and had Father Petre at last openly sworn of the Privy Council; his dispensation with the services of those noblemen who would not promise to support him in his campaign on behalf of religious toleration; his foolish and arbitrary conduct at Oxford; and many other things, not least of all his approval of Tyrconnel's policy in Ireland, had been followed by most evil consequences. Sullen disloyalty was widespread, and the announcement of the coming birth of what might prove to be an heir to the throne, with claims before those of the Princesses Mary and Anne, caused it to break out in a manner more indecent than unprecedented. In 1682, before the birth of the Princess Charlotte, the supporters of Mary and William had threatened to "make a Perkin Warbeck" of the child, if it should prove a boy. Now low and scurrilous pamphlets were scattered among the ignorant populace to persuade them that the statement about the Queen was untrue and that a false heir was to be foisted on them to keep the Protestant Princesses off the throne.

Whether the wretched Burnet had anything to do with these particular libels is uncertain. Not many months later he accepted the responsibility for the atrocious slander, and he was the undoubted author of other venomous attacks upon King James since his accession. In the safe shelter of Holland he had gained the post of religious and political adviser to a congenial

From a contemporary engraving.

FATHER EDWARD PETRE.

prince, who (though, to do him justice, he seldom extended to them the liking which he showed for Burnet) never hesitated to make use of the most dishonourable and dishonouring agents to aid him in his designs against his uncle and father-in-law. Under William's patronage the reverend doctor poured out the products of his evil mind against James and his Queen, and an unsatisfied demand for his extradition was one of the numerous causes of offence which nearly caused a war between England and Holland. By becoming a burgher of the city of Amsterdam Burnet defied extradition, but William deemed it advisable to tell him to retire from the Hague to Amsterdam for a time at the beginning of 1688; at the same time, by order of the States-General, he was given a guard of a few soldiers for his house.

According to Hoffmann, the Austrian Ambassador, writing to his Emperor in the spring of 1688, James was well on his guard against the schemes to check the lawful succession to the throne if a son should be born to him. But against such baseness as was arrayed against him no precautions were of avail. The young prince came into the world in the presence of a large crowd* in the Queen's private apartments,

* Among the *Portland MSS.* is a document written by Mrs. Dawson, whose name figures in the list below. (She was the Mrs. Margaret Dawson who, like the Countess of Bantry, was one of Queen Mary's ladies-in-waiting at the Coronation.) The most important part of it is as follows: "The 10th of June, 1688, being Trinity Sunday, the Queen was delivered of a son in St. James's House, there being present the King, the Queen Dowager, the Lord Chancellour of

although Her Majesty's unexpectedly sudden seizure obliged them to be summoned at short notice. The Tuscan envoy declares the bedchamber to have been public at the time of the birth to all ladies who chose to enter and the ante-room to all men, almost indiscriminately. Among the ladies, Frances was one, and she was thus in a position to bear personal testimony against the most cruelly preposterous lie ever invented against a mother. Unhappily, she could not transfer the witness of her eyes to another, very near to her in blood, but distant from her in place on this occasion.

The loyal Lord Ailesbury well says that "the scandalous things vile people invented and that fools blindly swallowed" at this period were "not worth the enlarging on." But among those who were ready to swallow the story of the mock-birth were many who can in no way be described as fools. They swallowed, but not blindly. One of these was Lady Churchill,

England, the Lord President of the Councill, the Lord Privy Seale, the two Lord Chamberlains, the Lord Arran, the Earls of Peterborow, Huntington, Craven, Feversham, Middleton, Murray, Milfort, the Lord Dartmouth, the Lord Thomas Howard, Sir Stephen Fox, Mr. Griffin, Sir Charles Scarborough, Sir Thomas Wetherby, Sir William Walgrave, Dr. Brady, physicians; Mr. Pearse, Mr. Phrayzer, surgeons; Mr. St. Armand, apothicary. The Lady Arran, the Countesses of Peterborough, Sunderland, Roscommon, Fingall, Tyrconnell . . . [*twelve other women's names follow, ending with*] myselfe, Mrs. Dawson, that did see the persons above named, and many were at the birth of the Prince of Wales. So soon as the childe was borne it was put into the armes of Mrs. de la Badie. The King then said to the Privy Councill, 'My Lords, you have all been true witnesses to the birth of this child, follow it and see what it is.' Which they did, and found it a son." (*Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report XIII., Appendix, Part* 2.)

as Frances's sister was now called. Frances, on her return from Paris in 1683, had found her junior married to Jack Churchill, no longer an ensign in the Guards as he was when she left England, but a trusted servant and strong favourite of the Duke of York, by whose influence he had been raised to a Scottish peerage. Further honours followed for the husband after James's accession, including a special mission to France, an English peerage,* and the colonelcy of a troop of the Guards; while the wife was transferred to the household of the Princess Anne. This last appointment, perhaps, can hardly be looked upon as promotion, though we hear of no disagreement between the Queen and Lady Churchill. But Queen Mary was not of the yielding disposition to live well with the imperious Sarah; and there was their difference in religion, moreover. Sarah's pronounced Protestantism unfitted her for the household of a Papist queen. It equally qualified her for attendance on the Princess of Denmark. It is extremely difficult to credit her when, much later in her life, she writes that her brother-in-law Tyrconnel attempted to enlist her aid in the furtherance of the King's wish to bring his daughter Anne over to the Roman Church. Tyrconnel could not have applied

* Churchill chose as his title that of Baron Churchill of Sandridge, Hertfordshire. We know from Sir Henry Chauncy's *Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire* (1700) that Frances and Sarah, as joint possessors of the manor of Sandridge, sold it to him; and as he received his title on May 14th, 1685, we have a clue to the date of the sale. Sandridge, as we have seen, was the last vestige of the Jennings family estate.

to a more unlikely instrument than his wife's sister to promote the triumphs of Rome. Only on the assumption that he thought her an utter hypocrite can we imagine him asking for her help in the matter.

There can be little doubt, on the contrary, that it was the influence of Lady Churchill, acting in concert with her husband, which induced Anne to conduct herself in so disgraceful a fashion over the birth of her half-brother. The first assurance of its approach threw her into a rage. And when the time approached, despite her father's earnest entreaty that she should stay and be present at the event, she withdrew to Bath; falsely alleging, with the aid of some obliging doctor, that if she did not go to Bath at once it would be most dangerous for her health. Five days after the birth had taken place the poor invalid returned from Bath to London. Still more reprehensible—in fact, we may say disgusting, in view of what her uncle Clarendon records about it—was her attitude over the meeting of the Privy Council called by the unhappy James on October 22nd, 1688, to receive proofs of the birth of the Prince of Wales If Anne is to be excused at all, it can only be on the ground that she, like her sister Mary—and, in fact, all the immediate descendants of the old Chancellor Hyde—suffered from a mental weakness which it is difficult to explain as coming from so sturdy a character as his. Anne was a victim to the governess whom she had put over herself; and that governess's

mind was, as usual, in perfect tune with her husband's. Ailesbury mentions Churchill as one of those who pretended to believe in a mock-birth. The fact that he already had an understanding with the Prince of Orange made it natural that he should pretend such a belief.

Fate has ruled it that John Churchill and Sarah Jennings should be heirs to almost as much obloquy as Richard Talbot and Frances Jennings, at least among the followers of that brilliant manipulator of history who hated all four so much. Churchill has, however, admirers so dazzled by his military achievements that they refuse to see the stains upon his character which Macaulay so relentlessly, not to say viciously, revealed; and partisans of Churchill can scarcely fail to be touched by the devotion of Sarah to her husband and so comprehend her in their defence. Talbot has no supreme military glory to cast a glamour about him, and political bias has therefore been allowed full sway in the verdict which has been passed upon him; and his wife's adherence to him and his cause has, of course, not been counted to her for merit. Yet no one comparing, without prejudice, the conduct of the brothers-in-law and their wives during the years 1687–9 can deny that one pair was honourable, the other not even commonly honest.*

* It is notable that the Churchills, the Tyrconnels, and Burnet, with their very different attitudes towards the Revolution—Burnet an open enemy, the Churchills false and the Tyrconnels true friends of James II.—should all have been accused of abnormal avarice. The charge against Burnet is illustrated in

Not long after the birth of the Prince of Wales, Lady Tyrconnel was released from her duties in attendance on the Queen. A newsletter of August 25th, 1688, mentions her return to Ireland. Her presence in Dublin did not escape the notice of either friend or foe, as is witnessed by two curious pamphlets of this period. In the first, published in London and entitled, *A Vindication of the Present Government of Ireland, under His Excellency Richard, Earl of Tyrconnel. In a Letter to a Friend*, an attempt is made to conciliate the colonists in Ireland by an allusion to her race and her husband's ultimate extraction. "As for the British in Ireland," writes the apologist, "they have not the least reason to be dejected, because they are sufficiently secure: our Governour's education, his stake he has in England, his most excellent, charitable, English lady, himself descended from a famous ancient stock of English nobility, Talbot.". . .

This produced a reply printed in Dublin, under the name of *A Letter from a Gentleman in Ireland to a Friend*

a bitter mock-epitaph upon him when Bishop of Salisbury, coupling his name with those of the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough. Two stanzas of this epitaph, evidently the work of a Jacobite and a non-juror, are as follows:

"Oaths pro and con he swallowed down,
Loved gold like any layman,
Wrote, preached and prayed, and yet betrayed
His Mother Church for Mammon.

* * * *

"If such a soul to Heaven is stole
And 'scaped old Satan's clutches,
We may presume there will be room
For Marlborough and his Duchess."

in Dublin, upon occasion of a Pamphlet entitled A Vindication, etc. One passage of this runs: "Our author has given very good reasons why the natives may be well content with their present Governour, but I cannot forbear laughing at those he has found out to satisfie the poor British with—my Lord Tyrconnel's most excellent, charitable, English lady. His high-sounding name TALBOT in great letters; a name that no less frightens the poor English in Ireland than it once did the French; a name which, because he is in possession of, I will not dispute his title to, but I have been credibly informed that he has no relation to that most noble family of Shrewsbury (though my Lord Tyrconnel presumes to bear the same coat of arms); a name, in short, which I hope will prove in time, *Vox et præterea nihil*."

The sneer at "his most excellent, charitable, English lady" is no doubt a reference to Lady Tyrconnel's alleged love of money, of which we have had hints already and of which we shall hear more hereafter.

On her arrival Frances found her husband exceedingly busy setting the Irish house in order according to his ideas, in anticipation of the threatened troubles across the Channel. The native Roman Catholics had been delighted at the birth of a prince, but by the mass of the colonists the event had been viewed with much the same feelings as by the disaffected in England. For Protestant loyalists rejoicings were

marred by the almost simultaneous prosecution of the seven Bishops. Lord Mountjoy, for instance, one of the non-Papist minority on the Irish Privy Council, concluded a congratulatory letter to Lord Dartmouth with a prayer that the counsels now pursued might be really for the King's interests, though they "look oddly to such as are remote." In Dublin the feeling of discontent was high and could not be disregarded; for, despite the migration of colonists' families to England which accompanied Clarendon in February, 1687, and continued steadily since, it was estimated that there were in the city even as late as the end of 1688 twenty thousand Protestants capable of bearing arms.

In such a condition of affairs Tyrconnel's activity, devoted for the most part since he became Lord Deputy to other branches of Irish administration, turned once more to the army. The remodelling which he had put in train as Lieutenant-General was vigorously carried out by his subordinates after his attainment of the higher office. He could not afford to dispense with the services of all the Protestants, either officers or men, for they were the only veterans in the army, and hence we find whole companies of them still under his command in the early months of 1689. He weeded out, however, a very great number of them and supplied their places with Roman Catholics to maintain the strength of the force. This only put at his disposal between seven and eight thousand men, and from

them one regiment was drawn off to England as early as March, 1687. A second was called for in August, 1688, and a third in September.* At the time of the Dutch invasion of England the Irish army had been depleted to the extent of 2,800 men, well over a third of its numbers. To fill the gap left by these was an urgent necessity and called for all Tyrconnel's energy, as well as for what he himself was not in a position to supply in Ireland, arms and pay for new troops. How matters stood while William of Orange was making his first attempt to cross to England in the face of what for the moment was not a "Protestant wind" may be gathered from a letter written by Tyrconnel to his King on October 3rd, sent by the hand of Patrick Sarsfield, and now in the British Museum.

"I have writ at large by Sarsfild to y^r^ Ma^ty^ yesterday," says Tyrconnel, "and will not give y^r^ Ma^ty^ any other troble in this but to beg of you to read my letter of this day's date to my lord president, and to consider well the necessetye thear is for y^r^ service, of dispatcheing with all speed what I desired in it, as well as what I writ to y^r^ Ma^ty^ yesterday, being much the same thing. I beg, sir, I may have a quick dispatch to

* These seem to have been all new regiments, that is, newly raised to take the place of others "reformed" out of existence. They were recruited in Ireland, but trained in England. One of cavalry had as colonel Richard Hamilton, one of infantry, Alexander Cannon (who subsequently fought bravely on the Royalist side in Scotland), and the third was of dragoons, all being given to Lord Dumbarton to command as brigadier. It is of these three regiments, apparently, that Tyrconnel writes to the King on March 17th, 1688, that he hopes he will put as many Catholic officers into them as he can.

my letters, for noe time is to be lost in rayseing new forces; I shall make them subcist as well as I can, tho the Revenue doe fale, wch it will certainly doe out of hand, for all trade is now given over hear, because of this invasion, but wee have plenty of meat and drinck hear, tho wee have noe mony. The Lord Jesus bless you and preserve you from the power of your enemyes. Would to God your sonn wear hear in safety, remember, Sir, that Portsmouth is the worst ayre in the world."

This allusion to Portsmouth is interesting in view of the King's action, some seven weeks later, in sending his infant son thither so as to be able to have him conveyed over to France in event of the worst befalling. It is clear that James had already broached the idea to Tyrconnel and that the latter had the prescience to doubt the possibility of putting it into execution, whether it was the English army or fleet, or both, whose fidelity he suspected. There was, it is true, an Irish garrison at Portsmouth, but the Lord Deputy may well have considered this, to use a phrase occurring in one of his early letters, "one drop of water in a hogsett."

While waiting for the arrival of the supplies which he so urgently needed, Tyrconnel prepared the way for bringing together the men for whom they were destined. Sending General MacCarty to Cork and Colonel Anthony Hamilton to Limerick as governors, he gave them secret instructions to obtain from the

leaders of the local Irish nobility and gentry lists of officers and men fit to be enrolled in new regiments under their own command. Thus he had at least the raw material of a whole new army when the time should be ripe to decree its call to the standard.

CHAPTER VIII

CRAB-TREE CUDGEL AGAINST HOLLOW CANE*

IT is very easy to condemn the folly of James II. by which he lost the throne of the Three Kingdoms for himself and his rightful heirs; and it cannot be said that English historians have neglected the opportunity of placing the blame upon him. Few of them have made any attempt to find excuses for his blindness, though for this at least there was abundant palliation. He was, with all his glaring faults, the most open and least subtle of his family; a great contrast, in this respect, with his father and his brother. Against him he had the dishonesty of his English subjects, his French allies, and his Dutch nephew. In the face of such a combination of forces he fell, as he was bound to fall.

* "The news of yesterday," wrote Robert Southwell to the Duke of Beaufort on December 14th, 1688, "is not so surprising as it is very great, for when one has a crab-tree cudgel and the other but a hollow cane, it was easy to see the event." (*Historical Manuscripts Commission, Report XII., Appendix Pt. 9, Beaufort MSS.*)

Lord Macaulay quotes, with great appositeness, in reference to James's successor the lines from De Foe's *True Born Englishman :*

> "He must have been a madman to rely
> On English gentlemen's fidelity."

But William of Orange did not rely on English gentlemen's fidelity. He took advantage of their treachery up to the point when they had assisted him to usurp the throne and then very plainly showed them that he put his trust only in his Dutch friends. James, on the other hand, did rely on his countrymen. In the bitterness of his disillusion he wrote to Lord Feversham (himself a Frenchman), on the eve of his first flight from London, of a "poisoned nation." But up to then he had shown a touching faith in that nation. The Austrian Ambassador wrote to his master on September 21st/October 1st that King James "had against him the whole clergy, the whole nobility and the whole of the land and sea forces, which must needs keep him apprehensive on every side." Hoffmann's own letters show James absurdly confident, nevertheless, and actually resentful that France, through the medium of d'Avaux, Louis's representative at the Hague, should presume to inform the Dutch that hostile action against England would be followed by a French declaration of war against them. No doubt James had an absolutely unwarranted belief in the fundamental attachment of his people to himself and his dynasty. But what censure is called for by

such egregious foolishness in comparison with that due to the baseness of those in whom he put confidence? If it be granted that it was necessary to check James's abuse of power, it still remains unquestionable that the check should have been imposed by men with clean hands. No Englishman whose judgment is not completely warped by political and religious fanaticism can look back with pride upon the conduct of Churchill, Devonshire, Shrewsbury, Halifax, Admiral Russell, Bishop Compton, and countless others* who considered it consistent with their honour to open negotiations for the sale of their country at a price extremely beneficial to their own pockets. The doctrine that the end justifies the means assuredly cannot be invoked on behalf of self-seekers. The rot which such people set up in English public life continued to corrupt it for considerably more than a century.

The politic kindness of Louis XIV. to his exiled brother-monarch at Saint-Germain was for a long time allowed by historical writers to obscure the ingrained falseness of his dealings with England. The charm of Louis's courtesy extended long indeed after his own death and the deaths of those on whom he bestowed it. It is now generally admitted, however, that he used James after the Revolution merely as a pawn in the great game which he was playing on the

* Sunderland may be left out of this list, because apparently no one has been induced, even by his betrayal of his master, to waste any admiration upon him.

European chessboard, and that he purposely only lent him sufficient support to make him troublesome to William of Orange. But his double-dealing did not commence with the Revolution which turned James out of England. It is true that James, on the throne, was a difficult man to help. Louis sent Bonrepos to England, as soon as it was certain against whom the Dutch military and naval preparations were directed, to offer a closer alliance and the aid of French ships and men. James, advised by Sunderland and impelled by his own pride, gave the agent a cold reception and sent him back to France unsuccessful in his mission. But, as Hoffmann writes to the Emperor on September 28th/October 8th, it was soon afterwards "plain that all France's declarations were but an illusion, for instead of fitting out a good fleet to support England according to her promise, she has not, practically speaking, a single ship ready, but, on the contrary, has her strength directed against Germany or elsewhither." Louis cannot have imagined that he was going to frighten William of Orange by mere words into keeping the peace with James, and it may therefore be concluded that he was ready to leave the English King to his fate. All that can be urged in his defence is that he probably was unprepared for the widespread treachery of James's subjects.

It is unnecessary to dwell upon the brilliant diplomacy—the word covers a multitude of villainies—by which the Prince of Orange took advantage of English

venality and French insincerity to surprise the kinsman who had so long ago guessed his evil designs against him. William has been elevated into the position of a hero by a supreme disregard of the qualities proper to a hero, unless we must revise our list of those qualities so as to include amongst them life-long devotion to self, unfaltering mendacity, and the aptitude to employ the basest of tools for the basest of ends. Very appropriate to the man was the statue erected to him at Petersfield, Hampshire, in 1732; a statue of lead covered with gilt. Economy decreed early in the nineteenth century that a coat of drab paint should take the place of the gilding on the Petersfield effigy. But in history—and in historical romance, also, down to the present day—the untruthful outer covering has been constantly renewed. "The Liberator" has become a legend. Yet he certainly has not imposed on posterity by the charms of his personality, since even the idolatrous Macaulay has not been able to conceal the unpleasantness of that or the fact that he was hated, before he died, by the deluded people who made themselves his subjects, to find him if not indeed, as James II. had prophesied, "a worse man than Cromwell," at least Cromwell's peer among those who have abused the name of liberty to cloak their despotic aspirations.

The Dutch army of invasion landed on November 5th (old style), and on the night of December 23rd the broken King left English soil for ever. Treason

had triumphed, almost bloodlessly; and in the few blows exchanged the traitors had scarcely suffered at all. Little attempt, indeed, had been made to punish them while there was yet time. Had James taken the advice of Lords Ailesbury and Feversham he would have "clapped up" Churchill at the end of October with six or seven others, owing to their attitude towards the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. Before the council of war at Salisbury he again refused the suggestion that he should send Churchill and Grafton under guard to Portsmouth. On November 24th Middleton, one of the two Secretaries of State, wrote from Salisbury to his colleague Preston in London: "Villainy upon villainy, the last still greater than the former. This morning Roger Huett brought news from Warminster that Lord Churchill's grenadiers went last night over to the enemy. . . . The Duke of Grafton and Lord Churchill are missing, and not doubted but they are gone after them into the enemy." The next day Middleton wrote: "His Majesty has commanded me to signify to you that the Lady Churchill should be immediately confined in the Earl of Tyrconnel's lodgings in St. James's House, and none admitted to her but her servants." On the 26th the King returned to town, to discover that at two or three a.m. Sarah, taking with her the Princess Anne, had left the Cockpit door at Whitehall in a coach and disappeared. It cannot be doubted that the defection of his younger daughter, which was entirely due to the empire of

Sarah Churchill over her weak mind, had much to do with the collapse of James. After a few spasmodic efforts, the only effectual among which were devoted to securing the escape of his wife and son, he abandoned the contest.

"The transactions of England strike unparalleled astonishment into the hearts of all the Irish," writes Dennis Scott in Dublin to his kinsman the Deputy-Governor of Portsmouth. Well they might. But the Lord Deputy was not paralysed by any astonishment which he might feel. After his letter to King James quoted in the last chapter he had pressed on with the preparations for increasing the Irish army.* Altogether he had been obliged to part with nearly four thousand men, more than half his original forces, to assist in meeting the invaders in England. These Irish troops, as it turned out, were entirely wasted, owing to the wholesale desertion of their English comrades to the enemy, so that the policy of transporting them to England proved most disastrous. For this,

* The author of *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland* says: "As soon as the King came up to London, on the 26th of November, 1688, from Salisbury, he wrote a letter to the Earl of Tyrconnel . . . letting him know how he was betrayed by his army; how he was abandoned by his people of England; and also giving his order and instructions what to do for his interest in this juncture. Immediately the Earl of Tyrconnel called a council, to which he made a proposal for raising an army to maintain the King's rights. Upon this proposal several arguments passed pro and con. But His Excellency was altogether for war, and showed plausible reasons for success, which opinion had the ascendant, and so 'twas decreed to levy forces out of hand, which was soon made known to the Catholick people throughout the kingdom." They had already been secretly prepared by the foresight of Tyrconnel, as is mentioned at the end of the previous chapter.

however, Tyrconnel was not to blame. To supply their places he had abundance of raw material, as we have heard, but very little else. Of the quality of the arms sent to him from England he had reason to complain, and apart from their badness they were utterly insufficient in number. An earnest request from him to the King for more to be sent to him from Carlisle was intercepted about the middle of December, which must have given his enemies an insight into his dire necessity. But even with a proper store of arms he would have found it difficult to convert his recruits into serviceable soldiers rapidly. Yet the situation was very dangerous. The Protestants had abundance of money and of men of the soldier class, and he had not ventured yet to disarm them. They were early prepared for action in the North. Tyrconnel, when obliged to send his last reinforcement over to England, had withdrawn Mountjoy and his seasoned troops, mainly Protestants, from Londonderry to Dublin, intending to replace them by a newly-enlisted Roman Catholic regiment.* But Londonderry would not admit the latter and was never again in the Lord Deputy's power. As a pretext for their action, the inhabitants put forward the unsigned letter addressed to Tyrconnel's old enemy, Lord Mount Alexander,

* As showing to what straits Tyrconnel was reduced for the equipment of his new levies, it may be mentioned that King (*State of the Protestants*, 115) says that this regiment, the Earl of Antrim's, was "without the King's livery . . . without any arms besides skeans, clubs, and such other weapons as kearns and tories used."

but purposely dropped in the street at Cumber, professing to reveal a plot to kill every Protestant, man, woman and child, on December 9th. This document had the true ring of the common anonymous libel from "a friend," but nevertheless was circulated all over Ireland among the colonists and apparently accepted by them as if it were genuine. The most timorous of them fled to the northern strongholds, to Scotland, or to the nearest ports of England and Wales, taking with them all they could carry of their property. Others contented themselves with sending their families away. John Stevens, author of the manuscript *Journal of my Travels since the Revolution* in the British Museum, records seeing at Chester in November "many ships full of women and children that fled from Ireland for feare of chimericall massacres." The Roman Catholics, however, were at least equally as scared. In their case, too, letters had a disquieting effect; not anonymous, however, but sent from friends in England and announcing that the young Duke of Ormonde (who had but recently succeeded his grandfather) was coming over with a considerable army to subdue Ireland. According to one of their opponents, some of them actually took steps to put their children under the care of Protestant neighbours. This was in Dublin, where for the moment the garrison was very weak.

In August, 1689, a Committee of the House of Lords, which had been appointed by the *de facto*

government in England to enquire into the condition of affairs in Ireland, took some very interesting evidence from refugees who had come over at varying dates between the previous December and May. Much information, from a hostile point of view, naturally, is herein given about Tyrconnel's proceedings and affairs in Dublin.

The witnesses before the Lords Committee varied considerably in their estimate of the relative number of the troops and of the Protestants in the Irish capital in possession of arms.* The ex-Recorder, Sir Richard Rivers, one of the earliest arrivals—he reached England in the second week of December—said that there were not less than twenty thousand well-armed Protestants in Dublin, and not above five thousand Popish soldiers in the army of whom but six or seven hundred were with Tyrconnel, while the entire store of arms at the Castle was guarded by about fourteen or fifteen men. Another witness, Robert Rochfort, reckoned the Protestants in Dublin about December 7th at seven or eight thousand men, well-armed, and Tyrconnel's force at not above one thousand men. Other computations put the armed Protestants as high as twenty-five thousand and as low as five thousand, and the troops between three thousand five hundred and two thousand. It is easy to understand the varying figures

* The total number of Protestants in the North of Ireland, according to a report given in to the Lords Committee on April 10th, 1689, was "not much less than 100,000."

of the military, since strategic movements were in progress. The fluctuation in the estimate of the Protestants must be due to the sanguine or cautious dispositions of the witnesses. But, whatever the correct figures, it is clear that Tyrconnel's armed supporters in Dublin were greatly outnumbered by his armed enemies; a disquieting position for him when he had to guard the arsenal for supplying all Ireland.

Early in December there was serious thought of a Protestant rising in Dublin to seize the Lord Deputy but it was not translated into action for lack of the support of Lords Mountjoy, Granard, and Meath. Rivers and Rochfort are agreed as to this. The latter says that Lord Meath asked Tyrconnel to be allowed to arm his own tenantry, saying that he could furnish him with arms if he wanted them. Tyrconnel in reply "swore that was rebellion, and if it were not out of respect to his family he would imprison him." The Earl was a Brabazon and, therefore, like Tyrconnel himself of Norman desecnt. He soon gave Tyrconnel cause to repent that he did not now imprison him, for he deserted to the Prince of Orange and held a command under him at the Boyne.

Doubtless it was the very perilous situation of Dublin in December which caused rumours to fly about that the Lord Deputy was willing to deliver up his sword of office already, although King James was still in England. The bitterly hostile author of *The State of the Protestants in Ireland* says that Tyrconnel purposely

spread the story, to gain time;* and certainly Lord Chief Justice Keating, in his letter to Sir John Temple in London at the end of the year, was under the impression that Tyrconnel (whom King declares to have induced Keating to write the letter in question) was ready to retire. But Keating had only recorded his conviction of the Lord Deputy's willingness to retire "upon the first signification of His Majesty's pleasure to that purpose"; and James was far from expressing any such desire. It was the fault of the colonists if they imagined that Tyrconnel was only waiting for easy terms from the King's enemies.

There were not wanting among the leading Roman Catholics some who advised the Lord Deputy to surrender, even threatening to desert him if he held out. They demanded that he should acquaint them with any terms which came over from England, as they wished to accept them. The witness Phillips says that the Earl of Limerick, Lord Gormanstown, and

* "When he found himself so very weak," says King (p. 112), "and so much in the power of the Protestants that nothing but their own principles of loyalty secured him against them, he betook himself to his usual arts, that is, of falsehood, dissimulation, and of flattery; which he practised with the deepest oaths and curses; protesting that he would be rid of the government very willingly, so as it might be done with honour: that it was easie for him to ruin and destroy the kingdom and make it not worth a groat; but impossible to preserve it for his master. Everybody wondered to find so great a truth come frankly out of the mouth of one they usually styled Lying Dick Talbot and who had been known, not without reason, many years by that name. Some believed that in earnest he intended to part with the sword." It is to be noted that one of the witnesses before the Lords Committee, Captain John Dunbar, stated: "We never believed Tyrconnel would quit the government. We looked upon his pretence of doing it as a sham."

several others went to Tyrconnel about Christmas, 1688, "and desired him to lay down the government, saying that if he would not they would lay down their commissions, it being a vanity to think of standing out against England; to which, it is said, Tyrconnel answered, 'My Lords, what would you have me do? There is none as yet come to demand the sword. Would you have me cast it into the ditch?"

In spite of his steadfast front, Tyrconnel was suspected, and perhaps rightly, of feelings of depression. It was believed that he was at least prepared for flight if the situation became worse. Phillips says: "He was observed to have melted down plate, bought up guineas, and shipped most of his best goods on board a ship belonging to one Golden, and it was said his Lady was to have gone. But the captain of the little frigate that always attends the Chief Governor, having notice that his Lordship designed to give the command to another, sailed away without his knowledge, which made his Lordship believe he had some design on the vessel in which his goods were stored, whereupon he brought his goods upon shore again, and ordered the ship to Galway, as Informant has heard and believes, for presently after, about sixty cars, all loaded, went by Informant's house under a great convoy commanded by Col. William Nugent, Tyrconnel's nephew, and these cars went to Athlone, and so to Galway; and though it was said to be ammunition, yet the

Irish as well as the English said it was his Lordship's goods."

Sir Robert Colvil, who was in Dublin at the same time and subsequently escaped to another part of Ireland, stated that, seeing in the Secretary's room at Dublin Castle commissions for about forty regiments, he told the Lord Deputy that " this was small encouragement for Protestants." Tyrconnel replied (almost in the words of the Prince of Orange when the deputation at Windsor urged on him the necessity of seizing the persons of the Irish Roman Catholics in London) that care should be taken. Colvil continues : " He courted me to have taken command on me. He told me he was weary of the sword, and he would throw it down with as much satisfaction as he received it ; but added : ' What shall I do with it ? Shall I throw it into the kennel ? ' He spoke twice to me to this purpose, I think, in the three days I stayed in Dublin. A week before I heard he had sent all his best goods aboard a vessel, but afterwards, fearing the vessel would be stopped, took them out again."

Whatever were Tyrconnel's inmost sentiments with regard to the position of affairs in Ireland, a great change came over him at the beginning of 1689, in the opinion of his enemies. This was brought about, strangely, by the action of the government in England. After the collapse of King James attention was at once turned to Ireland. As early as December 13th an attempt was made, by means of the shameful Irish

scare, to dispose of the troops whom Tyrconnel had sent over to England—and perhaps to massacre along with them any other Papists who could be secured, though there were less than five thousand of these in all fit to bear arms in England. This scheme failed, but Tyrconnel's men were quickly brought to a state of impotence. To secure Ireland itself was another matter. An attempt was made to enlist the King's aid in doing so. After the Council held at Whitehall on James's return to Whitehall for the last time, December 16th, a correspondent writes to the Earl of Derby of "an express sent to Ireland to supersede the Earl of Tirconnel's commission and to constitute the Earl of Grenard in his room, who is to turn all Papists out of comysion and disarm them." We never hear of this express reaching Tyrconnel. If he received it he must have suppressed it, recognising it to be no true expression of the King's will.

James having left England, the Irish nobility and gentry of the "English interest" party then in London pressed the Prince of Orange to take immediate measures to deal with Ireland. Meeting at the Duke of Ormonde's house, they drew up an address begging him to seize the persons of the Irish Papists in town as hostages against a massacre of Protestants in Ireland, and to send over to Dublin demanding the sword from the Lord Deputy. The Prince assented to both proposals. He took into custody without delay all Irish Roman Catholic officers on whom hands could

From an engraving by T. Cheeseman, after the painting by Verelst in Lord Beaulieu's collection.

FRANCES JENNINGS, DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL

be laid. With regard to the message to Tyrconnel, a suitable envoy was looked for to convey it. Unfortunately the choice made was the occasion of a tragedy, for which the blame has very unjustly been laid upon the selected messenger. Richard Hamilton, as we have seen, had been sent into England with a newly-recruited cavalry regiment in 1687. These men formed part of the force captured and interned in the Isle of Wight. Hamilton, however, had ostensibly made his peace with the conquerors, his relationship to the Duke of Ormonde no doubt rendering this easy. Now when it was desired to get into communication with Tyrconnel it was remembered that Hamilton was a favourite officer of his, as well as a connection of his wife by her first marriage. Moreover, he was recommended to the Prince of Orange by John Temple. This young man was the eldest son of Sir William Temple, one of the passive adherents of the Prince, who refused himself to take any part in public affairs, preferring to devote himself to the imitation of Dutch landscape-gardening at his estate near Farnham, but had no objection to his son actively espousing the cause of the invaders.

John Temple accordingly interested himself in the matter of securing Ireland for his Dutch master, and apparently opened a correspondence with Tyrconnel's secretary, William Ellis, before Hamilton's mission was suggested. He imagined that he had influence with Ellis, who may well have led him on, with or without

the connivance of Tyrconnel. Next, when recommending Richard Hamilton, Temple is said to have given a guarantee for his trustworthiness; and Hamilton, having taken a safe conduct from the Prince of Orange and undertaken not to rejoin the Irish army but to return to England if he should not be successful in persuading Tyrconnel to surrender, set off about the beginning of January.

To conclude the story as far as it relates to Temple: When the news arrived in England that Hamilton had thrown off all disguise and returned to his allegiance to King James, and it was seen that the time spent on negotiations with Ireland had been wasted, Hamilton's guarantor came in for hard words. Then followed information of James's landing in Ireland and of heavy fighting in Ulster, whereon some people were unkind enough to speak of the blood being on Temple's head. The Prince of Orange, now styled King, obviously did not cast the blame upon him, for in April he appointed him his Secretary of War; but a few days after his appointment Temple hired a boat on the Thames, ordered the men to row him to Greenwich, and on the way sprang overboard and was drowned. He left behind him a paper, on which was written: "My folly in undertaking what I could not execute hath done the King great prejudice, which can be stopped no easier way for me than this. May his undertakings prosper, and may he have an abler servant than I!"

Clarendon reports in his *Diary* on April 20th: "People discoursed to-day very variously of Mr. Temple's having made himself away. Some said it was trouble of mind, for having managed a correspondence in Ireland with Mr. Ellis for the obtaining of that kingdom; and that he now found his designs frustrated; and that thereby other methods had been neglected. But others said it was a perfect phrenzy, he having had a feverish indisposition for some days: which was true."

One thing is clear in the affair, which is that Temple's suicide was not directly caused by Hamilton's conduct nearly three months previously. It would be fairer to reproach William Ellis as the cause. But Temple's own melancholic temperament, exaggerated by his temporary illness and his mortification at his failure to make good his claim to be able to lay Ireland at William's feet without a blow struck, is sufficient to explain his deed. We cannot admit him to be a martyr to the villainy of those who refused to betray their King, much as we may regret his end.

Richard Hamilton, having made his arrangements with the government in London, started off for Ireland. Concerning his arrival there we fortunately find preserved, among the evidence given before the already-mentioned House of Lords Committee, a declaration on oath of a Major Richard Done, described as late of Tuber-Dalough, King's County. This man escaped from Dublin in March, 1688, but only after the Lord

Deputy had arrested him on board a ship in the harbour and imprisoned him in Dublin Castle for fourteen days. With a bribe of a hundred guineas to Father Geoghegan, Tyrconnel's chaplain at the time, he managed to get out of the Castle, and on another ship to make his way over to England. His declaration, as far as it concerns Hamilton, is as follows:

"Deponent was in Dublin in January last, and hearing that a vessel was arrived from England at Ring's End, went with one Theophilus Taylor and the master of a vessel to see who the passengers were. He counted seventy men in red coats, and among them Col. Richard Hamilton, together with eleven other officers. The Colonel, whom he knew well, went with several others to a tavern, and from the next room deponent heard plainly their discourse. After salutations, the Colonel broke out into loud laughter, saying he could not forbear it, thinking how finely he had shammed the Prince of Orange into a belief that he had interest and inclination enough to prevail with Tyrconnel to lay down the sword and submit to him. Col. Dempsey, who had come to congratulate him, replied: 'What interest could you have in the Prince, or how got you it, to persuade the Prince to believe you?' Hamilton answered 'I wanted not friends to persuade him into a confidence of me, on which account I got my liberty and this'—(pulling out a pass from the Prince, which he said was for himself, eleven officers, and a hundred and forty soldiers, which were all he could get account of to be

in Liverpool, Chester, and Holyhead, else he believed he could have got a pass for seven hundred as well as seven score, adding 'Had King James been so well advised as he might, he need not have come out of England for want of friends to support him'). After much other discourse to the same effect, a coach came to the door with Sir Richard Nagle and Secretary Ellis. Hamilton said jokingly to Ellis, 'How, Brother Sham, are you there? The Kingdom of Ireland is beholden to you and I, for diverting this storm off from them; else you had ere this an enemy in the bowels of the Kingdom.' Then turning to Nagle, he said, 'Could you think, Sir Richard, that Ellis could have such an interest with the Lord Deputy as to persuade him to lay down the sword and submit to the Prince?' Sir Richard replied, 'It is a wonder to me that it could be thought or credited that he could do it alone, there being in England at that time many Irish gentlemen who, had they been consulted with, could have informed the Prince that Ellis's interest was not sufficient to do it.' After this they took coach and went away together." . . .

This evidence, unless we reject it as false, for doing which there is no reason, disposes entirely of the supposition that Hamilton went over to Ireland with any intention of carrying out the mission which he had accepted. It must, therefore, increase Hamilton's guilt in the eyes of those who forget that he was an officer bound by oath of allegiance to his lawful King and who

only remember that he had given a subsequent promise to perform certain things to a foreign usurper, which promise he immediately violated. Hamilton met treachery with treachery, and in so much his conduct is indefensible. But had he kept his promise to the Prince of Orange he would have been immeasurably more blameworthy, if a traitor in very good company as far as numbers went. The possibly apocryphal story of William's cheap sneer about the captive Hamilton's "honour" at the Battle of the Boyne, is pointless in consideration of the honour of William's English adherents and of William himself.

The witnesses before the House of Lords all agree as to the wonderfully inspiriting effect of Hamilton's arrival in Dublin upon the loyalists in general and upon Tyrconnel in particular. "When Colonel Richard Hamilton came over," says Dr. Francis Marsh, Archbishop of Dublin, "they thought he had stolen away. . . . The Irish were very low then, but from his coming they took heart." He considered this "the crisis, the fatal house of Ireland." Sir Oliver St. George gave evidence that "the Papists in Dublin made bonfires when Dick Hamilton came over, saying he was worth 10,000 men." The English colonists on the other hand, according to John Phillips, "were dejected when Colonel Hamilton came over, he being a Popish general."

The personal popularity of Richard Hamilton appears to have been the reason for the rejoicings of his friends

in Dublin when he reappeared among them. Tyrconnel's liking for him, no doubt, partly explains why he was able to encourage him also so much as he did. Both Archbishop Marsh and Phillips make the Lord Deputy's inclination to abandon Dublin disappear on Hamilton's coming; the former saying that he had previously told him personally that he would be glad to be out of the government if he could have his master's leave—though Dr. Marsh would not commit himself to an opinion that Tyrconnel was "willing to resign to King William." Phillips stated that about Christmas time Tyrconnel "was observed to be much kinder to the Protestants than formerly, but on the coming over of the Marquis de Pont [Pointis] from France and Colonel Hamilton from England, he was strangely altered and said he would lay the kingdom in ashes before he would give up the sword."

Possibly it was Hamilton's assurance of the number of King James's friends across St. George's Channel which lightened Tyrconnel's heart; for, as we know, the Frankensteins of England had already begun to appreciate the inconveniences of their monster. Particularly in the army was discontent rife, coupled with shame at the thought that England had been invaded and conquered while the mass of her natural defenders looked on. Not all those who had failed in their duty were Churchills, Cornburys, Graftons, and Kirks. Many, both officers and men, looked on their handiwork, sick at heart. This did not prevent,

however, the realisation of William's ambition, the end of his scheming, bribing, and lying, on February 13th, 1689, when in his uncle's palace of Whitehall he received the crown from the Marquis of Halifax in the presence of the convention which held the place of Parliament. With England on that day, the kingdom which traitors had laid at his feet, he took over also the legendary France, and Ireland, which Halifax had as much right to offer him as he had to offer France. But Tyrconnel still lived to show the Prince of Orange that there were some, at least, whom no price he might pay would buy.

CHAPTER IX

TYRCONNEL RECEIVES HIS KING

WHEN Tyrconnel rejected what the Duke of Berwick in his Memoirs calls "the advantageous offers made to him by the Prince of Orange," he had, by dint of exertions which did the utmost honour to his fifty-nine years and his bodily condition, put the kingdom of Ireland in a fair posture of defence against the coming aggression. Reports going over to England credited him with having raised thirty thousand men by the middle of January, forty thousand by the beginning of February. Nor were they exaggerated. But there are two letters written by Tyrconnel himself to King James which give us a vivid picture of the state of affairs as seen by the one man who knew the whole truth. In the first of these, written on January 29th (old style), 1689,* the Lord Deputy expresses some surprise that his master should not already be

* This letter, which is too long for reproduction here, will be found in Appendix E.

acquainted with Ireland's condition—James and Lord Melfort had just asked for a full report—when he had kept him constantly informed ever since his accession to the throne. Having made this complaint, Tyrconnel proceeds to set forth the situation, partly in the body of his letter, partly in a series of answers to some questions which had been sent to him. Certain portions of the manuscript are missing; for instance, an exposition of the present state of the Revenue. But this is the only important omission.

In brief, Tyrconnel finds the Roman Catholics of all four provinces of Ireland unanimous and most zealously affected to the King. He will not answer for even a hundred of the Protestants, who are "generally tainted with the principles of England" and in several parts of Ulster are in actual rebellion. Of the old army there remain four infantry regiments, one battalion of Guards, three cavalry regiments, and a troop of mounted grenadiers. He has lately given out commissions for forty regiments of foot, four of dragoons, and two of horse. "All which"—it is not clear whether this includes the old army or not—"amount to neare forty thousand men." They are, however, for the most part "without arms to defend them, cloaths to cloath them, or money to subsist them, or any visible way to maintaine them, unlesse by letting them live on the spoyles of the people, which in six months' time will destroy both nation and army." Money is the prime necessity. "With arms and

ammunition I may assemble a considerable body of naked men together without clothes, but, having no mony to subsist, all the order and care I can take will not hinder the ruin of the country, nor a famine before midsummer."

Tyrconnel points to the way in which the City of London has voted supplies to the Prince of Orange and how his troops are already marching on the Western seaports preparatory to the invasion of Ireland. He is deeply disappointed with the French King's lack of support so far to "a Catholique country," but is sanguine that if King James will come over now with what he asks for, all will be well. He does not hesitate to use some rather bold language: "If, Sir, Your Majesty will in person come hither and bring with you those succours necessary to support this country, which may not exceed the present allowance given you there . . . with arms, ammunition and some officers, . . . I will be responsible to you that you shall entirely be the master of this kingdom and of everything in itt; and, Sir, I begg of you to consider whither you can with honour continue where you are when you may possess a kingdom of your own, plentifull of all things for human life."*

* The Abbé Rizzini, who was in Paris at the time, bears witness to the powerful effect of Tyrconnel's arguments on his master. On March 2nd (new style) he writes to the Duke of Modena: "The British King was not at first disposed to start so soon, according to his wont, but pressing letters from Tyrconnel, imploring him to come as speedily as possible, made him take a sudden resolution to depart."

The second letter exists only in a French translation preserved in the War Office archives in Paris. It bears no more exact date than February, 1689, but is clearly later than the other letter. Retranslated, this letter runs as follows :

" Since I have had assurance that Your Majesty was in France I have let pass no occasion to represent to you the sad state of the kingdom, which I have done by several ships, having addressed my letters to M. Daniel Arthur, Banker, of Paris. Some days ago, too, I sent Baron Rice with Lord Mountjoy, who was fully instructed to put before Your Majesty the true state of our affairs, with the most likely means of preserving this country. I have only to add thereto that five days after, M. de Pointis arrived here with Your Majesty's letter and instructions for me and to inform himself concerning this country, about which he is fully instructed, and has gone from Waterford to return and carry my answer to Your Majesty's letter and instructions and a note of the things of which we have immediate need, in which I have been very modest for fear of turning away the King of France from the design of aiding us by asking too much at the beginning : but Your Majesty may be assured that what I have asked is absolutely the least for our mere subsistence. I discovered from M. de Pointis that we shall be amply aided in all things, but he did not seem so sure that we should be furnished with the money of which we have need. If we are not immediately furnished

with at least 50,000 crowns in ready money, it will be impossible for me to bring forward any army.

"Your Majesty can judge when you know that at this time I have actually raised about 40,000 infantrymen, from whom I design to draw 25,000 of the best, besides 2,000 dragoons and 20 troops of cavalry which I am now raising, and I leave it to Your Majesty to consider how I can clothe, gather and maintain them without money, for we have remaining little or no revenues, and there seems to be here no money, while all the inhabitants are going off to England, foreseeing the great miseries threatening this kingdom.

"The King of France cannot think it much to furnish us with 500,000 crowns for one year, since this is not the fourth part of the cost of this kingdom to sustain itself, and Your Majesty may be assured that not a penny shall be applied to aught but the urgent needs of this army, which when once I shall have it clothed (which cannot be done without money), I hope to be able to make subsist without ruining the country.

"The arms are not come which Your Majesty has told me were sent, nor is there any news of them. 20,000 fire-arms, with a good provision of all sorts of ammunition, and all belonging thereto, should be sent, 12,000 swords at least, numbers of officers of all ranks for the cavalry and dragoons, and all things necessary for maintaining a long and bloody war.

"To delay sending this aid is to ruin us, for if the army of the Prince of Orange sets foot here before help arrives, I shall have a difficulty in extricating myself; but if help arrives first I doubt not to answer to Your Majesty for this kingdom. It is our last cast, in which I shall contest every inch of ground down to our uttermost man, if I can be furnished with troops in time.

"If Your Majesty would take a step hither to arrange our affairs, you could return again afterwards if you found it necessary. God keep your Majesty," etc.

Tyrconnel alludes in both these letters to two events which call for attention; the mission of Mountjoy and Rice to France, and the visit of the Marquis de Pointis to Ireland. Certain circumstances in connection with the former of these have drawn upon Tyrconnel severe censure which, if the ordinary account of the mission be correct, is well merited. Lord Mountjoy, one of the very few Protestant Privy Councillors still remaining at the outbreak of the Revolution, was so far trusted by the Lord Deputy that when, at the end of December, 1688, he desired to make a last effort to gain over Londonderry for the King, he sent him with six companies of his regiment, three of which were Roman Catholics, three of the same faith as their commander, to take peaceable possession of the town if possible. Accounts vary as to the precise happenings, but the final result was

that the Protestant companies were left as garrison of Londonderry under a Scottish lieutenant-colonel, Robert Lundy. The *Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland*, the author of which is a staunch admirer of Tyrconnel, gives the following version of what followed :

" The Lord Deputy . . . being troubled at the loss of Londonderry and Enniskillen, the best garrisons of the North, and perceiving all the Protestants of Ulster ready to follow the same resolutions with those two towns, he gets, by a wise and seasonable dissimulation, the above-mentioned Lord Viscount Mountjoy, a Protestant of the North, to go in his name to the King at St. Germain's, in France, to demonstrate to His Majesty the necessity of yielding Ireland to the Prince of Orange ; which message Mountjoy freely embraced, as believing he could persuade the King to a compliance ; and thereby that he might keep the country in the same peaceful condition for the sake of the Protestants therein. This was by His Excellency of purpose done to remove the said Mountjoy out of the way, that he might not now take the occasion of heading the considerable numbers of Protestants, who in all likelihood would choose him for their general, as being the best soldier amongst them all, and the most leading Protestant of Ulster. The Lord Deputy joined with him in commission Sir Stephen Rice, a Catholick and Lord Chief Baron or Judge of the Court of Exchequer, to the end his design might be less

suspected by the Lord Mountjoy. And so both together set forth from Dublin on the tenth of January, 1688, old style, that is 1689, *stilo novo*. Upon their arrival at St. Germains the Lord of Mountjoy was sent to the Bastile in Paris, where he remained till the war of Ireland was over."

The writer, it may be seen, has no condemnation for Tyrconnel's ruse; but, as he was not only a fervent Jacobite but also a bigoted Roman Catholic, Whig historians look upon this as a part of his general lack of principle and do not trouble to consider whether Tyrconnel had any reason to suspect Mountjoy's fidelity. We have, it is true, no means of determining this point, upon which depends the verdict which should be passed on Tyrconnel's conduct. Mountjoy on his release from the Bastille in 1692, in exchange for Richard Hamilton, immediately volunteered for the army of William of Orange and died fighting for him at Steinkirk. Had he been a loyalist before, however, his wrongs would have been sufficient to pervert him, so that it does not follow from his behaviour in 1692 that he was a traitor at heart in 1689. In any case, Tyrconnel's "wise and seasonable dissimulation" cannot command our admiration; but it was neither treacherous nor inhumane if he had any good ground for suspicion against Mountjoy.

The Marquis de Pointis, according to Tyrconnel, arrived in Ireland five days after the departure of Mountjoy and Rice. He had been sent by Louis into

England as one of his agents in 1688, conveying then a warning of the advanced state of the Dutch preparations. Now he travelled with a Captain Roth, who was the actual bearer of King James's letter to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, "hopping," as James wrote, "you will be able to defend yourself and support my interest there till summer at least." All that Louis had so far agreed to do in support of Tyrconnel was to send seven or eight thousand muskets—"not being willing to venture more arms or any men till he knows the condition you are in, so that it will be absolutely necessary that you send back this bearer as soon as may be, with one or two persons more in order thereunto." Pointis had also his instructions from Louis to collect information on the state of Ireland, the spirits of the people, the number of Tyrconnel's forces, the available food-stock, and so on.

The French agent returned home on February 21st with the report that there was an army of forty thousand loyalists only awaiting the King's arrival to ensure success for the cause. Tyrconnel had already, through the medium of Sir Stephen Rice, conveyed to Saint-Germain his conviction that James's presence was the one thing desirable; and the combined efforts of the envoys resulted in the expedition to Ireland.

In anticipation of this event Tyrconnel redoubled his efforts. Thanks to his previous wisdom it was possible to enrol troops as rapidly as arms could be

found for them. The nobility and gentry of the districts in which they were raised, in return for their commissions as officers, provided subsistence for their men for three months; but arms and mounts for the cavalry they were in most cases unable to find. Tyrconnel determined to supply the deficiency at the expense of the colonists in Ireland. Hitherto he had treated these with moderation, apart from his discrimination against them in the matter of official appointments, both civil and military, and in the regulation of the corporations. As we have seen in John Phillips's evidence above, he had grown even milder toward them at the end of 1688;* but was strangely altered after seeing Richard Hamilton and the Marquis de Pointis and began to be severe to the Protestants. The following is King's account of how he took their arms and horses:

"In order to get them he drew nine or ten regiments to Dublin, and a proportional party to every place where the number of Protestants was considerable; and without the least notice or declaration premised, on the 24th of February, 1688, he took away their

* He seems to have anticipated the message which James had sent him when a fugitive at Gravesend on December 18th. Accidentally meeting with the Abbé Rizzini, Modena's envoy, he gave him some secret commissions to Queen Mary in France, in case any mishap should prevent his own escape thither. One was that the Queen should make known to Tyrconnel that, even if the Roman Catholics should be ill-treated in England, he must still act with moderation towards the Protestants in Ireland. Rizzini, as a matter of fact, did not reach Paris until after the King himself; and James was not there until December 28th, so that the message cannot have gone to Tyrconnel at the time of which Phillips speaks.

arms and horses throughout the whole kingdom, except in the North, where he durst not yet attempt it. The method of doing it in Dublin was this, he filled all the streets and lanes with foot and horse; and then for so much of the city as lies within the walls he sent the city officers to signifie to every house that if they did not send in every sword and bayonet as well as fire-arms in their possession into the churches (which were generally seized for this use and filled with soldiers) they should be left to the mercy and discretion of the soldiers, both as to their lives and goods. . . . To avoid this terrible dragooning they immediately delivered in near 3,000 fire-arms, besides swords, bayonets and pikes, in Dublin alone. At the same time some hundreds of horses were likewise taken, without any other reason than that they belonged to Protestants. Without the walls it was much worse than in the city. . . . The next day after this disorderly dragooning came out a proclamation dated February 25, 1688, signifying that this disarming and taking away horses was done by order of the Government."*

Such was the light (but King has much more to say than this, though he does not allege that anyone lost his life at the hands of the soldiers) in which

* Tyrconnel's opinion of the value of the arms seized was not high. He told King James in his report to him when they met at Cork that he had been able to distribute among his newly raised troops "about twenty thousand muskets, most of which, however, were so old and unserviceable that not above one thousand of the fire-arms were found to be of any use."

Tyrconnel's resolute action was regarded by one of his severest critics. A few pages later King remarks that "it was but reason" that the law in previous reigns allowed none but Protestants to have arms in their possession. If religious intolerance were not the great tragedy of history, King's arguments would be amusing reading.

Having secured as much as he could of the military equipment, and with it the tranquillity of the South of the kingdom—a very effective answer, by the way, to the first published declaration of William and Mary to all "their subjects" in Ireland to lay down their arms by April 12th, on the penalty of being proclaimed rebels and traitors—Tyrconnel proceeded to attempt the conquest of the North before help should arrive from England. Richard Hamilton, now Lieutenant-General, marched into Ulster at the beginning of March with two thousand five hundred men. If the estimate of the Northern Protestant population at one hundred thousand be correct, then clearly Hamilton's force was ridiculously inadequate; but Tyrconnel in his report to the King a couple of weeks later stated that the two thousand five hundred were "as many as could be spared from Dublin." The little army of invasion achieved some initial successes and penetrated as far as Coleraine at the time of the King's landing. Hamilton was accused of allowing his troops too much licence; a charge which is repudiated with indignation by the loyalist Charles Leslie, author of the

Answer to King's State of the Protestants. Leslie attributes any outrages which occurred to the "Rapperees or half-pike men, as they called them." In an internecine struggle like that in Ulster allegations of outrage are always plentiful and are usually held true or false according to the political bias of the judge. No charge of inhumanity was ever brought against Hamilton personally, and it is probable that he, like his chief, had to suffer for the sins of those whom neither of them ever welcomed as allies, the banditti of the unsettled districts of Ireland. These were undoubtedly encouraged, however, by the policy of disarming and taking horses from the Protestants. James himself, while admitting the necessity of that policy, comments: "But that too brought inconveniences along with it, and caused so great disorder that every Catholique thought himself entitled to pillage the Protestants and render back to them the usage they had before received at their hands."

In addition to his military preparations Tyrconnel took steps to keep in Ireland what little money there was until the King should arrive. Early in February he positively forbade its export from the country; though of course such a measure was extremely difficult to enforce when, as he admitted, all the inhabitants (those of substance, that is to say) were making their way to England, foreseeing the great miseries threatening Ireland. About the same time he made another order still more unwelcome to the moneyed class, but

necessary if his already almost empty treasury was to be kept from further depletion. He extended the liability of providing quarters for the new troops from innkeepers and certain classes of tradesmen, as heretofore, to private individuals; "all gentlemen of the best quality, if Protestants," observes King mournfully. As the officers of these troops had guaranteed their upkeep for a period of three months, they were maintained practically free of cost, and thus a large sum of money was saved to the exchequer. Far more desperate courses than these were to follow before long. But already a great impetus was given to the emigration of the colonists from a land where it was clear that, however little they might contribute in the way of personal service, the financial burden of the coming struggle would fall heavily upon them. It cannot be denied that a grave injustice was done to a few of them, who endeavoured to remain loyal amid most trying circumstances; but the great majority, whose sympathies with the Rebellion were scarcely disguised, had little right to complain of what was, after all, the fortune of war.

The much-hoped-for event at last came to pass. King James made his first attempt to sail from Brest on March 5th/15th, after a long delay through the unfavourable state of the weather. An accident rendered it necessary to put back for another two days, but on the 7th/17th the fleet actually started on its way and, all being propitious, reached Kinsale

harbour five days later. Tyrconnel had been warned of the King's departure from Paris by his great-nephew Dongan, sailing from Brest on a fast frigate, but the necessities of the situation kept him in Dublin until he was actually notified of the arrival of the fleet.

Numerous accounts, of varying degrees of authenticity, exist of the landing of the King in Ireland and his meeting with Tyrconnel. In his own *Memoirs* he tells of his reception " with all imaginable joy by his Catholic subjects " at Kinsale and says that his first care was to have the money, arms and ammunition which he brought with him safely landed and secured in the fort. After this he called into Council the Comte d'Avaux, whom Louis had assigned to him as his principal French adviser (with the status of Ambassador), and his own head minister Melfort, whom he made Secretary of State for Ireland. Before them he received an account of the condition of affairs in the country from those who had come to wait on him at his landing, of whom the chief were Sir Thomas Nugent and Justin MacCarty, now created Lord Mountcashel. He gave immediate attention to military matters, ordering Mountcashel to form seven regiments of foot from the troops in the neighbourhood, to arm some already-enrolled dragoons, and to transport the army to Dublin with all speed. On March 14th the Royal party moved to Cork and were lodged at the Bishop's Palace. Here Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, who had

accompanied James into exile, introduced Wettenhall, Bishop of Cork, and the Protestant clergy to James, who received them kindly. On the next day there was a levée, at which Cartwright records that he saw the rebels of Bandon at King James's feet and the minister "in an elegant speech begging their pardon," which James granted. There can be no doubt of his extreme anxiety to conciliate his remaining Protestant subjects.

Some days after he reached Cork, the King says, Tyrconnel came to wait upon him and "was immediately created Duke, in recompence of his great services and successful endeavours towards the preservation of the kingdom of Ireland."* The Marquise Campana de Cavelli discovered in the Imperial Library at Vienna an anonymous contemporary manuscript describing the meeting, which is interesting as obviously being from the pen of one who was present. "The King of England having arrived at Kinsale," says the writer, "the Earl of Tyrconnel came to Cork to receive His Majesty. Could he have gratified the impatience which he had to see him, he would have come to the very spot where he had disembarked, or even further, had it been possible, but his presence was necessary in the heart of the kingdom to maintain all things in their place. He came to see His Majesty followed by

* Mr. T. C. Croker, who edited *Macariæ Excidium* for the Camden Society, says: "Tradition asserts, but within the editor's knowledge the statement rests upon nothing more, that Tyrconnel met the King at Barry's Court Castle, about ten miles north-east of Cork, where James created him a Duke."

the guards allowed him by his quality of viceroy, whom he brought to accompany the King. There were besides these a hundred gentlemen on horseback, brought by their anxiety to see and pay their respects to His Majesty. The King did him an honour which sovereigns rarely pay their subjects, for having perceived him, he advanced to meet him at the door of the chamber and embraced him. He gave him the praises due to the unshakeable firmness which he had shown in his service, and did him the honour not only to make him dine at his table, but set him at his right and the Duke of Berwick at his left. In a word, the King gave him all the marks and signs of satisfaction which were due to such a subject and testified his esteem by creating him duke. After he had received an exact account of all the affairs of Ireland, His Majesty held a council, in which the new Duke had the honour to take part. The whole Court of the King congratulated him on his noble firmness and the fidelity to his legitimate sovereign of which he had given proof, so that he tasted now all the pleasure that a true gentleman can experience when he has done what his honour and duty demand of him. The King of France so valued the merits of this Earl of Tyrconnel as to send him the Cordon Bleu and a casket containing twelve thousand louis."

If the Lord Deputy had exulted in the rewards which he had won by his loyalty and untiring exertions it would have been only natural. But he did not

allow himself to be intoxicated by his success. He put before his master a report on the condition of Ireland which did not err on the side of optimism. This report has been already alluded to. Tyrconnel could boast of the possession of all Ireland except the extreme North and of an army sufficient, as far as numbers were concerned, to maintain the rightful King against his enemies. But the same complaints which he had made before he was obliged to repeat again with additional emphasis. He lacked arms, mounts for his cavalry, artillery (having "but eight small field-pieces in a condition to march, the rest being unmounted"), powder and ball, veteran officers, and finally "money in cash."

To remedy the lamentable deficiencies of his supporters in Ireland, James had brought with him both arms, officers, and money. The supply of arms, however, was utterly inadequate and far beneath what Louis or his minister Louvois promised; nor was their quality good, as we learn from a complaint sent to the latter by d'Avaux a little later. About two hundred officers, British and French, accompanied the fleet to Kinsale. Among James's own subjects were his sons the Duke of Berwick and Lord Henry FitzJames; members of the loyal nobility such as the Duke of Powis, Lord Dover, Lord Melfort, and Lord Thomas Howard; gentlemen of high military rank like Colonels Patrick Sarsfield, Wauchope, and Dorrington; and many of lower grade, among them a Captain Talbot,

whom one might be tempted to identify with Tyrconnel's illegitimate son. Of the French contingent the principal soldiers were Conrad, Comte de Roze,* a Livonian who had risen to the rank of Lieutenant-General in the service of France and had been lent by Louis to be James's commander-in-chief; Lieutenant-Generals Maumont and Pusignan, and Major-General Léry; and the Marquis de Pointis, who, as an artillery officer, returned to Ireland to take charge of the weakest branch of the defending army. The aid of any French troops had been refused for the present, but facilities were given for the assembly of British exiles in French territory and their formation into a force which was to follow the King in a second fleet from Brest.

In the matter of money Louis was not so sparing as in arms and men, but he employed a diplomacy which disguised his willingness to give. He entrusted d'Avaux with half a million livres, instructing him, however, to keep secret his possession of two hundred thousand of these unless urgent need should force their production. Similarly he put three hundred thousand livres into Maumont's hands and arranged that another two hundred thousand should be paid to him shortly; but he was instructed not to make known that he had so much in his possession. Prudence, no doubt, demanded the maintenance of a reserve fund. Yet

* He usually appears as Rozen, Rosen, or Rosene; but from French sources it seems that the correct form was Roze.

when the pecuniary needs of his ally were so pressing, it was a decided risk for Louis to take to keep a large portion of the available funds entirely at the discretion of two men, however great his confidence in them.*

* The extent of the confidence put in Maumont may be gathered from the secret instructions given to him before he left France. His principal duty, he was told, must be to stand well with Tyrconnel and to penetrate so far into his mind as to induce him to impart to him the measures by which he thinks it possible to keep Ireland. Maumont is also, without taking sides, to attempt to discover the dispositions of the different factions in Ireland. Maumont's premature death gave him little chance of showing his ability to follow his instructions.

CHAPTER X

DISSENSIONS AT HEADQUARTERS

AFTER his meeting with Tyrconnel, King James left Cork on March 20th and proceeded in his company to Dublin. "All along the road," enthusiastically writes the author of the *Jacobite Narrative*, "the country came to meet His Majesty with staunch loyalty, profound respect, and tender love, as if he had been an angel from heaven. All degrees of people, and of both sexes, were of the number, old and young; orations of welcome being made unto him at the entrance of each considerable town, and the young rural maids weaving of dances before him as he travelled. . . . The King made his entry into Dublin on the 24th of March, being Palm Sunday that year. He was received by the Lord Mayor, Sir Michael Creagh, and Aldermen in all their formalities, by the principals of the city, and by the garrison under arms, while the bells rang, the cannons roared, and the music, on stages erected in the streets, harmoniously played."

That James himself was pleased with his reception is clear from his own description: "His entry there was accompanied with all the marks of duty, honour and affection imaginable; the streets were lined with soldiers, and hung with tapestry, evened with gravel, and strowne with flowers and greens, the appearance of the majestrates, nobility, gentry, judges, and of all ranks of people, was sutable to the most solemn cerimony of that kind, and performed with the greatest order and decency immaginable: the King rideing on horse back was more discernable to the people, whose lowd and joyful acclamations made him some sort of recompence for the indignities he had suffer'd from his other subjects."

For the reverse of the picture we need only turn to the despatches of d'Avaux and Roze, full of bitter complaints of the dearth of money, horses, provisions, and trained men in Ireland. But, after all, it was to remedy such a state of affairs that they had been sent over from France.

Much had been achieved by the Lord Deputy when he had brought the King safely to Dublin and shown him the warmth of the Irish in his cause. Yet this was, in reality, but the beginning of the task. The most immediate steps waiting to be taken before standing on the defensive against the coming invasion were the conquest of rebellious Ulster and the gratification of the Roman Catholics by enacting the legislation which they demanded for Ireland.

On the day after his arrival James issued a summons for Parliament to meet on May 7th. Whether or not he anticipated that he would be forced at last to abandon his determination to maintain the Settlement, he could not dispense with Parliament, on which he must depend to find him supplies for the war.

With regard to Ulster, a report was to hand from Richard Hamilton, announcing satisfactory progress so far, but asking for more troops, as the rebel position at Coleraine was too strong for him to attack. A consultation was held between the King, Tyrconnel, Melfort, and d'Avaux, who formed an inner Cabinet for the direction of affairs, as to what measures should be taken to assist him, and it was decided, though against the wishes of Tyrconnel, that James himself should go North. We have now, thus early in the day, a warning of the dissensions which were to make the positions of both the King and the Lord Deputy so unpleasant. One of those about the Court at Dublin records that when the siege of Londonderry was discussed, in the event of Coleraine being taken, "It was proposed to prepare store of tools and other things necessary for a siege. Upon which His Majesty caused his magazines to be looked into. But, instead of finding things necessary, as he expected, he was informed by the Earl of Melfort, who had visited the said magazines by his order, that there was nothing at all of what was required, nor even anything that looked like a magazine."

John Drummond, first Earl of Melfort, was one of those unhappy adherents of James II. who failed to make a single friend (at least, among people of consequence) except his master; nor has he found one since. It is clear that there must have been some good reason for his unpopularity with his fellow Jacobites. But it is equally clear that he cannot have been all they accused him of being, for the simple reason that the charges made against him were mutually incompatible. All agreed, however, that his advice to James was bad and part cause of his ruin. Yet the King, when dying, bestowed on him a dukedom, promised ten years before, in reparation for suspicions which he had been induced to entertain of his fidelity. It is difficult to believe that Melfort was a traitor; for traitors found the game more paying than he did. But he was certainly an unscrupulous intriguer and an untiring underminer of the reputations of others fighting side by side with him.

Melfort declares that he was obliged against his will to attend His Majesty to Ireland, and that he dreaded Tyrconnel's "temper and pride." Perhaps it was in order to punish these that he set himself to work on his arrival in Ireland to oppose all the Lord Deputy's schemes. He was unlucky in finding that French support was forthcoming for Tyrconnel, since it was for his advocacy of a French alliance more than anything else that he had made himself hated in England.

There was, however, a sufficient reason for the action

of d'Avaux in espousing the side of Tyrconnel against Melfort. We know from the letters of Louis's representative that he regarded the latter as "neither a good Irishman nor a good Frenchman," as one whose affections were entirely set upon his own country. He knew that his great desire was to persuade King James to the invasion of Britain, and that he supported the Ulster journey because he thought it most likely to lead to such a result. D'Avaux, having his instructions from his own master, was determined to prevent this. He saw in Tyrconnel one resolutely prepared to defend Ireland and assumed in him a zeal for the French interests which was not justified in fact, though perhaps a natural conclusion from his outward conduct. And young Walter Dongan, as we know from the Ambassador's own statement, represented to him very favourably his great-uncle's views.

Tyrconnel certainly paid court to d'Avaux. The already quoted manuscript in the Imperial Library at Vienna tells how he lodged him in "a fine house at the end of the town of Dublin," and when the King gave his first public audience (on April 5/15th), came personally to fetch him, with "twenty six-horse carriages and many other four-horse ones." Doubtless he made every effort to convince the French ambassador that his dearest wish was to fall in with the desires of King Louis. But documents exist to prove that he had already expressed himself to quite a different effect. On March 15th he had addressed to

the leading men of Scotland, such as William Douglas, Duke of Hamilton, and Melfort's brother, the Earl of Perth, letters giving them news of the King's landing at Kinsale. What he wrote to Hamilton is as follows :

"If I were not very persuaded that you are the self-same Duke of Hamilton in all things that you were when I had the honour to be known to Your Grace, I should not venture to assure you of my most humble service and respects at this time, nor inform you that upon Tuesday last, the 12th of this month, our King arrived at Kinsale, in the west of this kingdom, with a fleet of 37 sail of ships, with arms for 24,000 foot, 4,000 dragoons, and 4,000 horse, and, which is better, 800,000 French crowns in ready money. This news, I am confident, will be welcome to Your Grace, as also that I have 50,000 horse, foot and dragoons raised for him here, well armed and disciplined. The King brought over with him 200 French and Irish officers, some of which were wanted. This good posture of His Majesty's affairs will, I hope, encourage Your Grace to stick by him and yourselves. I hope before the end of July to have the honour to embrace you in Scotland, and by word of mouth to assure you how truly I am," etc.

Tyrconnel, it may be seen, exaggerates the amount of assistance brought to Ireland by the King, and also the good condition of the Irish army. But it was natural that he should wish to raise the spirits of those whom he imagined (wrongly in some cases) were eager

to uphold the royal cause in Scotland, and we cannot justly conclude from his inaccuracies of detail that his whole letter was false and that he had no intention of aiding in the invasion of Scotland, if it should prove possible. He opposed, it is true, James's visit to Ulster. A sufficient reason for this was that the meeting of Parliament was fixed for May 7th, and James's presence was imperative in Dublin on that date if Tyrconnel was to wring from him the concession for which he had so long striven in vain. If we may hazard a guess at the plan of campaign which Tyrconnel had at the back of his mind, he wished to carry through the reversal of the Acts of Settlement and other parliamentary measures which seemed to him necessary; to reduce Londonderry, and with it the remainder of Ulster; and only then to cross over into Scotland and unite with the loyalists of that country in the reconquest of England for James II. He had, in pursuance of such a programme, to deal with the King, Melfort, and the English and Scottish Jacobites, who desired to cross over into England or Scotland without delay, and who dreaded to touch the Settlement or even demanded its maintenance; with the French representatives, who had come to Ireland with orders to make James as strong as possible there, but to prevent his embarking on dangerous enterprises in other directions, which Louis was not prepared to assist; and with the Irish Nationalists, whose one desire was for independence, whether under the sovereignty of James or

not, and to whom James's loss of England and Scotland was a blessing rather than a subject for regret.

Tyrconnel's supreme skill in handling the divers parties has been recognised by few, even among those who fought on the same side. Prejudices arising from differences of religion, race, and temperament blinded the eyes of critics who, politically, should have been inclined to look kindly upon him and to acknowledge his merits. In a man of his exuberant personality, with his gusts of temper and violences of speech, it was doubtless difficult to recognise the stubborn character which no obstacle turns aside from the path toward the goal. Or, to vary the metaphor, the leaping flames and clouds of smoke made it hard to divine the steady burning of the fire of the spirit within. In a word, he was too subtle for those who observed him.

Tyrconnel's opposition to the King's resolve to join the army in Ulster appears to have led to great friction in the Cabinet, and the opportunity was taken early in April of sending him temporarily away from Dublin on a mission to carry out a measure which he himself had recommended. Disappointed (notwithstanding his brave words to Hamilton) in the amount of the support brought to him from France, he saw no remedy for the evils of the situation but to reduce the number of the forces which he had spent the previous months in raising. Moreover, the French representatives who accompanied the King were

uncomplimentary in their criticism of many of the new men,* and still more of the officers, who, indeed, in the majority of cases, had no pretensions to military experience. He suggested, therefore, that some companies in all the infantry regiments should be disbanded, and that the army should be reduced to thirty thousand men, including two thousand cavalry and three thousand dragoons; and this was agreed. The author of the *Jacobite Narrative* laments this procedure. "Whether this was a prudent action," he says, "it hath long since been argued pro and con. However, we must here acquaint the reader that the disbanded captains and subaltern officers were struck to the very heart by this breach; because their uncommon zeal for the cause, and their treasure spent on the subsistence of their respective bands, and their expectation from thence of lasting honour, were all now brought to nothing in their opinion, though the said officers were dismissed with the King's thanks and promise of preferring them upon the first occasions."

Tyrconnel himself relented somewhat when he came

* Nor is John Stevens flattering, though his words convey with them a partial explanation. "What our army either was or might be made," he says, "is very hard to give an account of. The common computation was incredible, for most men reckned the whole nation, every poore country fellow having armed himself with a skeine, as they call it, or dagger, or a ropery like a halfe pike, weapons fit only to please themselves, or else to put them into a posture of robbing and plundering the whole country, under pretence of suppressing the rebellious Protestants." Rapparees, if mistaken for soldiers, were not calculated to make a good impression on the observer.

to undertake his task. A Jacobite journal, quoted by Macpherson in his *Original Papers*, records that "the Duke of Tyrconnel, at his return from visiting the troops, acquainted His Majesty that he found amongst the infantry so many good men that he could not think of disbanding them; and therefore he kept up, in some regiments, 20 companies, instead of 30 [? 13]; and in others 22 companies," etc. In all he appears to have retained the services of 35,000 men in place of the 30,000 originally proposed.

While on his tour among the regiments Tyrconnel maintained correspondence with Richard Hamilton in Ulster. Some of Tyrconnel's letters survive, though, unfortunately, in a very dilapidated state. They are very interesting as showing his great affection for Hamilton, whom he addresses as "Dear Richard" and, on one occasion, as "*Mon cher frère.*" On April 17th he writes from Kilkenny: "[If you] knew how ill I have been of late, [how] I am wooryed and hurryed about, [you wo]uld easily excuse my not having of [late wr]it so oftne with my owne hand. . . . Assure yourself, Richard, that I love [you as] much as ever, and that I will ever do so." In another letter he says: "As for your brothers, Anthony and Jack, you [may rely that] for theyr owne sakes as well as [for yours I will] doe by them as if they wear my owne. . . . Anthony has a regiment and is Brig[adier and] will very soone be a Major-Generall. Jack has Mountjoy's regiment, and I hope [will be] Brigadyer

Photo by Emery Walker, after the picture by an unknown artist in the National Portrait Gallery.

COUNT ANTHONY HAMILTON.

as soone as Anthony is [? advanced]. Adieu, Richard. You know how [I love] you and them, and that I will [do all] in my power for them."

The illness to which Tyrconnel alludes on April 17th is no doubt that which partly gave rise to the report which we find next month in an English newsletter, which announced the death of the Duke of Berwick and "Tyrconnel just expiring of the black jaundice"! The wish was father to the tale; for Tyrconnel, however ill and "wooryed and hurryed about," was destined to cause William and his adherents plenty of anxiety before he expired. But his health was sufficiently bad to keep him from taking a prominent part in public affairs for some months. A portion at least of the time he spent either at his country house, Talbotstown, or at the Viceregal summer residence at Chapel-Izod, and he does not appear to have returned to his official duties until the end of August, when he left a bed of sickness to cope with a situation by then grown extremely gloomy.

King James, after the Lord Deputy's departure from Dublin, "posted away to the camp at Derry in order to preserve his Protestant subjects there from the ill-treatment which he apprehended they might receive from the Irish." Arriving there on April 18th, he met with a very different reception from that for which he had hoped, and, being shot at from the walls, was soon convinced that a siege must take the place of the negotiations by which it had been expected the town

would be won to submission. Accordingly, he started back for the capital, taking with him Marshal Roze, and leaving Hamilton and Maumont in charge of the beleaguering operations, with Pusignan, Pointis and Berwick to assist them. The plan of a royal descent upon Scotland was defeated, to the joy of the French. D'Avaux had quitted James before Londonderry was reached, disgusted both at the hardships of the journey and at the King's obstinate determination to cross the sea if Londonderry should fall. The stalwart inhabitants of the Protestant stronghold relieved his mind of a great anxiety when they refused to be used as a stepping-stone to Scotland.

James returned to Dublin before the end of April and was soon apprised of the arrival of the second French fleet from Brest, bringing about fifteen hundred English, Scottish and Irish troops for him, and more money, arms and ammunition. Admiral Château Renaud reached Bantry Bay on April 30th, but on the following day was obliged to sail out and drive off a hostile squadron under Admiral Herbert. The engagement was insignificant, but was made the occasion of a *Te Deum* service at Dublin.

On May 7th the Irish Parliament duly met for the business to which the native Roman Catholics were looking forward so eagerly. Tyrconnel seems to have been totally prevented by his illness from attending the sessions personally, for he is not recorded to have sat in the attenuated House of Lords (numbering

thirty-six members in all, including eight Protestants), who helped to make the new laws. But his influence in the Commons was naturally very strong, the constituencies having been all regulated according to his directions.* And now he had the satisfaction of seeing carried out the scheme of justice, as it appeared to him —of revenge, as it appeared to his religious and political opponents—to which he had devoted so much of the second half of his life. "It would without doubt have been more generous in the Irish," observes King James in his *Memoirs*, "not to have pressed so hard upon their prince, when he lay so much at their mercy." Tyrconnel felt this himself, for he used his endeavours to moderate the excesses of the extreme Nationalists in Parliament, receiving help for this purpose from d'Avaux. The repeal of the Acts of Settlement, however, he was determined to see; and here, again, the French Ambassador was in full sympathy with him. James fought hard. He had planned a proclamation after his landing, assuring loyal colonists of the enjoyment of their estates. Yielding to Tyrconnel's and d'Avaux's advice, he had refrained from issuing this, but in the King's Speech on May 7th he had refused to go further than to speak of "relieving such as have been

* King (*State of the Protestants*, p. 171) alleges that "the common way of election was thus: the Earl of Tyrconnel, together with the writ for election, commonly sent a letter recommending the persons he designed should be chosen; the sheriff or mayor being his creature, on receipt of this, call'd so many of the freeholders of a county, or burgesses of a corporation together as he thought fit, and, without any noise, made the return."

injured in the late Act of Settlement, as far as may be consistent with reason, justice, and the public good of my people." He could not stand out, however, against the insistence of the Lord Deputy and the French, the latter turning the scale, according to O'Kelly. "It is much doubted to this day," he says, "if Count d'Avaux, Ambassador of France, had not warmly interposed, minding him often of his engagement to Louis XIV. to redress the injustice done to his subjects, whether any other consideration would prevail with the King to restore to the loyal Irish the inheritance of their ancestors, which they lost in the service of the kings his father and brother—though the late English proprietors were at that time in open hostility against him."

The Act of Repeal was passed, after an unavailing warning by the few Protestants in Parliament against its unfairness and impolicy, and landed property in Ireland was by law restored, as far as possible, to the condition in which it had been before October, 1641. There was a clause for the reprisal of those who had genuinely purchased estates, which was put in to qualify the manifest injustice of the Act, William King says, but which he claims to have benefited none but Roman Catholics.

James's opposition successfully defeated another cherished scheme of the Irish, which was to repeal Poynings' Law, whereby the supremacy of the King and Council in England over the Irish Parliament

was guaranteed. But he consented to an extensive Act of Attainder, undoubtedly the unwisest step taken during his stay in Ireland, since it condemned not only actual rebels, but also a great number of neutrals, some of whom it drove into the hostile camp. This Act was manipulated, moreover, by the Irish extremists in a vindictive manner towards those against whom they had personal grudges, and stands condemned on that ground alone. It was bitterly resented by the adherents of the Prince of Orange, who, with the usual logic of partisans, replied with the Bill of Attainder introduced into the English House of Commons on June 20th, 1689, but not made law until December, 1690. The English measure, as originally planned, contained one highly objectionable feature in common with the Irish, in the extremely short period which it gave to the proscribed persons to make their peace. In this respect, however, it had at least that justification, that the sentiments of those whom it named were beyond doubt.

Out of the forfeited estates of the attainted a sum of twenty thousand pounds a year was voted to Tyrconnel to support his new dignity of Duke. It could have been wished, for Tyrconnel's credit, that he had refused this grant; but unfortunately he had, in such matters, no scruples superior to those of his contemporaries. It is noteworthy that his conduct in accepting the grant is not made the subject of condemnation by his enemies. They chose rather

to accuse his wife of sharp practices in connection with another act of the Dublin Parliament.

Of the Duchess of Tyrconnel we find scanty notices during the year 1689. The condition of Ireland was such that a woman had few opportunities to make herself prominent. During the summer months there was practically no Court, in the social sense of the word; nor had James brought the materials of a Court with him from France. Her husband's temporary retirement through ill-health, too, kept Frances in the background. But, according to her critics, when she saw an opportunity of making some money she did not neglect it. It has been mentioned before that she was credited with a share of the avarice which was the most unpleasant trait of her sister Sarah. Now the great want in Ireland, as Tyrconnel had so earnestly pointed out before James's arrival, was money; and this had been little remedied by the sums which Louis had sent over for his brother monarch's use. A disastrous but unavoidable measure was decided on, to put into circulation a base coinage. Parliament had voted the King a subsidy of twenty thousand pounds a month; and to find the money on June 18th it decreed that copper or brass coins should be minted to pass as silver. (Did James II. remember, we may wonder, his grandfather's boast that he had restored pure silver to Ireland?) It is recorded that, in all, the nominal value of these tokens coined was over a million and a half sterling; but the process was

gradual, and at first its evil was not appreciated. The *Jacobite Narrative* says: "That coin did this good, that the poor did not want, and buying and selling was brisk for the first half-year, until the people began to fear the power of England, which began to appear in Ireland by the first army the Prince of Orange sent over under the conduct of Marshal Schomberg."

An early ill consequence, however, of the issue of base coins was that those who had the power to refuse them had the opportunity of making illicit gains; and it is averred that the Duchess of Tyrconnel was one of those who thus abused her position. Her principal accuser is William King. In the summer of 1689 he was a captive in Dublin Castle. In the diary which he kept during his imprisonment one passage runs as follows:

"Mrs. C—— came to see us in the afternoon, and told us that Lady Tyrconnel owed her £12, of which £6 for rent and £6 for malt she had bestowed in charity on the Nunry [of Dei Gratia in Dublin, of which the Duchess was one of the principal supporters]. She had frequently petitioned and spoke to her about yt; yesterday she had promised her positively her money and to give her steward order about it and had bidden her to come for it to-day, which she did. She met my Lady's steward, who told her that he had by order of Lady Tyrconnel sent men to bring away her copper which cost £60. This startled Mrs. C——, who told him she could not believe it: that she came

for £12, which being a debt of 2 years standing her Grace had positively promised it that morning. He assured her it was true, and desired her to make application to his Lady, which she did and with much ado obtained of her Grace an order to stop bringing the copper on condition she should not call for the £12."

The author of *An Account of the Transactions of the late King James in Ireland*, who is as bigoted as King against all Jacobites and all Papists, has a similar tale. "Thus have I heard," he says, "that Colonel Roger Moore was served (but I do not aver it upon my certain knowledge), who having an incumbrance of £3,000 upon the Lord Dillon's estate, who is married to the daughter of the Lord or Lady Tyrconnel, she sent for him and told him that, having some money at her command, and being very desirous to take off the burthen from her daughter's estate, she was content to pay him off in ready money, provided he would make some handsome abatement of the sum due. The gentleman, being complaisant to the lady, and very willing to receive money in such a time, freely consented to abate a thousand pounds, so the rest might be paid down at once. The lady seem'd very thankful, and appointed him to come next day, and to bring the deeds and obligations with him, and to receive his money. Accordingly he came, and having given a legal release, the lady opened a door and shewed him a long table covered over with copper and brass,

and tendered it for his payment, which whether he rejected in passion or hired a cart to carry it away I cannot tell."*

As so often, we are confronted by the question as to how much belief is to be put in the statements of virulent enemies against the subjects of our biography.

While the Parliament to whose existence he had contributed so much was passing its measures in Dublin, Tyrconnel was still in his retreat, which is clearly shown to have been also a tent of Achilles by a letter written by the Marquis de Pointis to King Louis from the camp before Londonderry on June 3rd/13th. Pointis was in charge of the very indifferent and insufficient artillery with which the Royalists vainly attempted to coerce the city. He now says:

"I am assured that Lord Tyrconnel's discontent, as much as his indisposition, has contributed to his retirement to a country house, and that he has even himself explained that he does not wish any more to mix himself up in another *affaire*. It is alleged that the Duke [? of Berwick] is always too much disposed to

* In his *State of the Protestants*, pp. 97-8, King complains of the unfair treatment of the Dublin tradesmen by James's followers and says: "If they had ready mony, tho' they had been formerly customers to Protestants, and in their books, they never came near them any more. This practise was so universal amongst them that even the women learn'd it; particularly the Lady Tyrconnel's daughters. For thus the Lady Ross and her sister Dillon treated several shopkeepers, falling furiously upon them in the former terms [*sc.* calling them Dogs, Whigs, Rebels and Traitors] because their servants refused to trust." It cannot be denied that it would have been more dignified for the Duchess's daughters to have replied to the refusal of credit with the time-honoured expedient of withdrawing custom.

effect savings, even to the prejudice of the service, while Tyrconnel has ever been diffident in suggesting even indispensable requirements, finding in His Majesty a resistance almost insurmountable to spending his money on things absolutely necessary. It is also alleged that this opinion originated with Lord Melfort, who desired to see things thus. If those here discover this, Lord Melfort, who is already not too agreeable to them, would become very odious indeed, which would be unfair. I do not know anything positive against him. One may, however, bear in mind that both he and his brother were at first very zealous persons, that afterwards, under the late King of England, they became most ardent episcopalians, and that lastly under this one they were made converts. The history of Sunderland is not advantageous to the new converts."

It is a curious coincidence that on the same day on which this letter was written, Melfort was writing to Louvois, urging that a French fleet should be sent to carry King James over to England or Scotland; and Louvois was writing to d'Avaux of "the horrid confusion" of affairs in Ireland, warning him that if the French succours were uselessly employed there no more would be sent, and stating that James must, "forgetting that he has been King of England and of Scotland, only think of what may advantage Ireland and make easy the means of his subsisting there."

The relations of James's chief councillors had grown

worse since the meeting of the Dublin Parliament. Partly, no doubt, the enmity between Tyrconnel and Melfort was aggravated by the mutual dislike of their ladies. Lady Melfort, a Scot like her husband (being daughter to Sir Thomas Wallace), had insisted on accompanying him to Ireland; but it would have been far better for him had he left her behind. She had, in common with Frances, great personal beauty, and was accused of resembling her, too, in her liking for money, so that it is not surprising that they should be on bad terms and should increase the bitterness of their two husbands against one another. At least one angry encounter took place between Melfort and Frances during Tyrconnel's illness. But it was a more serious dispute which drove the Earl and the Duke still farther apart. Melfort was the prime supporter of James's schemes to treat the colonists moderately and tolerantly, and countered Tyrconnel's parliamentary policy by holding back the money which passed through his hands as Secretary of State. The French and the Irish said that much of the money never left his possession at all; but we have no means of judging whether he was as dishonest as they represented.

In his already mentioned letter to d'Avaux Louvois had said: "If Londonderry cannot be reduced it would be as well not to leave the troops to perish before it, which the King will require to defend himself against the Prince of Orange." The French

had been very annoyed at the careless conduct of the siege, whereby Maumont and Pusignan had both lost their lives in a sally by the garrison. Why this should have been considered the fault of the Irish rather than the French generals is not clear; but the sacrifice of two experienced officers was certainly a great disaster. The warring elements, French, Irish, and British, at the head of royalist affairs all agreed at least upon the unsatisfactory progress of the siege of Londonderry. Whether in order to divert the attention of the Prince of Orange from the Continent, to make Ireland a half-way house to Whitehall, or to secure the country's independence, it was necessary that opposition to the King's authority should be crushed without loss of time. With the approval of all, therefore, Marshal Roze set out to Londonderry to take over charge of the beleaguering army and to bring reinforcements to it.

Unhappily Roze was a greater failure than his predecessors. He had scarcely arrived before the city when he disgusted James so much by an attempted act of cruelty—the story is too well known to need repetition—that he remarked to d'Avaux that were the Marshal an Englishman he would be hanged; an expression which d'Avaux thought "very strong," but did not reply to, seeing how much the King was carried away by his feelings. James did not confine himself to a single angry outburst, moreover. As he was sending Lord Dover to Paris to beg for the assistance of some French

troops, he instructed him also to ask for Roze's recall "as one, after having done what he did at Londonderry, incapable to serve us usefully."

After his bad start the Marshal was unsuccessful in sustaining the military reputation which he had made in France. Finally on August 1st he broke up his camp and retired on Drogheda. Two events decided him to this course of action. Two days previously occurred the rout of the troops, mostly raw levies, sent into Fermanagh under Viscount Mountcashel, with Anthony Hamilton in command of the cavalry; Mountcashel being wounded and left a prisoner, and Hamilton escaping to undergo a court-martial, at which he was lucky to be acquitted. This cast a gloom over the besiegers; but on the following day worse happened, for a vessel from England ran the blockade untouched and brought in supplies of food to the all but starving garrison. The result of fifteen weeks' siege, in the words of the *Jacobite Narrative*, was the "losing about two thousand men from first to last, of which number several were fine gentlemen, and several heads of families, and all noble sacrifices to a most noble cause and worthy of lasting memory." All hopes of an invasion of Scotland by way of Londonderry were at an end. The only assistance which was given to the brave Dundee was the transport of some few hundred Irish in July—the month in which Tyrconnel had hoped to have the honour of embracing the Duke of Hamilton in his own country. This force was too

small to save Scotland, at any rate when Dundee fell on the field of Killiecrankie.

Even before the abandonment of the campaign against the Protestant strongholds in Ulster there had been considerable depression at headquarters in Dublin. The internal dissensions, in no way quieted by the absence of Tyrconnel; the King's dissatisfaction with both d'Avaux and Roze; the unwillingness of Louvois to furnish further assistance, except some officers to take the place of those lost at Londonderry; and the general lack of supplies of all kinds in Ireland—all this would have been bad enough without the constant arrival of news from England (enormously exaggerated, no doubt) about the preparations being made for the despatch of Marshal Schomberg with an invading army. Dublin in the seventeenth century was always the home of panic, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics held the upper hand. It was so in July, 1689, and on the 15th James was driven by his advisers to order a fresh disarmament of the Protestants, which seems to show either that the tales of the first disarmament under Tyrconnel were much exaggerated, or that James's presence in the Irish capital had been followed by great lenity towards those who re-armed themselves. Now the Protestants were commanded to surrender all their weapons and horses in fifteen days; yet even after this it was thought necessary to issue a similar order once more in the following October.

Other steps indicative of alarm were taken, as when after Parliament at Dublin was adjourned on July 20th some of the prominent colonists were arrested and sent to prison. But the terror grew worse when Schomberg was known to be on the English coast ready to sail for Ulster. Happily it never took the form of any recommendation from a responsible person such as Lord Macaulay attributed to d'Avaux, that there should be " a St. Bartholomew . . . a general massacre of the Protestants of Leinster, Munster and Connaught."* James received with wrath, as d'Avaux's letters show, the comparatively mild proposals which the French Ambassador put forward for " making sure of " the Protestants in event of some of them rising in rebellion when the invaders landed; and his dislike for Louis's representative and his determination to get rid of him were greatly strengthened.

Schomberg landed unopposed at Bangor, County Down, on August 13th. Roze's retirement from Ulster had permitted this, as the author of the *Jacobite Narrative* very justifiably complains. He might also have mentioned that the French navy, although at this time in a position to do so, made no attempt to prevent his crossing St. George's Channel. As it was, Schomberg was able to disembark in peace and to form a junction with the Ulstermen, and a fortnight after

* Mr. D. C. Boulger, in his *Battle of the Boyne*, pp. 99-103 (and in a letter to the *Athenæum* of December 9th, 1911), completely reveals Macaulay's dishonest distortion of evidence to support his charge against d'Avaux.

his arrival compelled the surrender of Carrickfergus. The movements on the royalist side were leisurely in comparison. James himself left for the front on August 26th. Two days later Tyrconnel is heard of in Dublin. King writes in his prison-diary on August 28th: "A great court meeting of officers was held in the Castle. D. T. was there; it is said that D. T. must go to the camp, for the soldiers would not fight with [? without] him." Tyrconnel, however, could not go to the camp, and had apparently dragged himself from his sick-bed to attend the meeting; for he retired once more to bed, going to Chapel-Izod, as being within easy reach of Dublin. Before long he was compelled to rise again, and he rose to some purpose. Schomberg had steadily advanced until on September 7th he reached Dundalk, where he pitched his camp. Rumour continued to exaggerate the numbers of his army; which was indeed largely swelled by the Irish Protestants who had joined him on the march south, but was not nearly so strong as his opponents believed. Their mistaken impression made them timorous. Story says in his *Impartial History* (the author being a very pronounced Protestant and Whig, the title of his work is somewhat misleading): "Mareschal de Rose was very much concerned at this; and he with some others were for deserting Drogheda and Dublin and retreating toward Athlone and Limerick. . . . This my lord Tyrconnel heard of when he was sick at Chapel-Izzard, and went immediately to Drogheda, where he told

them that he would have an army there by next night of 20,000 men, which accordingly proved true, for they came in from Munster on all hands."

The Duke of Berwick states in his *Memoirs* that it was "by the efforts of the Duke of Tirconnel" that an army of twenty-two thousand men was collected at Drogheda. The official Jacobite publication entitled *A Relation of what most Remarkably happened during the last Campaign in Ireland*, says of Tyrconnel's work in bringing troops together to oppose Schomberg that his "zeal and fidelity to the crown, in the worst of times, can hardly in history find their parallel." And, finally, d'Avaux wrote to France on September 10/20th: "Fifteen days ago we scarcely hoped to put affairs upon so good a footing; but my Lord Tyrconnel and all the Irish have laboured with so much zeal that all is in a state of defence."

Tyrconnel, as we have remarked, rose to some purpose.

CHAPTER XI

TYRCONNEL DEFEATS HIS OPPONENTS

IT is a significant conjuncture of events that Tyrconnel's return to public life was almost simultaneous with the King's determination to send Melfort on an errand to Versailles. The complaints of the Irish and French against the Secretary of State had been incessant from the time of James's arrival in Cork. He diverted the funds to his own use, mismanaged the stores, held back horses urgently needed for mounting the cavalry, took bribes from the colonists, and quarrelled with the King's other advisers. The last accusation was certainly true, but James refused to believe the remainder of the indictment against the unpopular Scot. He recognised, however, the impossibility of trying to conduct affairs with a constantly squabbling Cabinet. Tyrconnel could not be dispensed with. His enormous value was proved by the way in which everything had gone amiss during

his illness, and by the enthusiasm shown by the Irish over his return to activity. Tyrconnel still controlled Ireland,* whereas Melfort stood for nobody but himself. He was, indeed, immensely useful to the King in one way, that he was willing to do the hard work of any number of offices provided that he could keep other people out of them; and James complains of the amount of business thrown upon him personally when Melfort left. But even this industry did not compensate for the hatreds which he aroused.

Melfort himself had grown so acutely conscious how matters stood that he came and asked to be sent away. As an excuse for his departure, the King commissioned him to go and see with what success Dover had met, to urge again the necessity for some French troops in Ireland, and to persuade Louis that the time was ripe for a diversion in England.

Melfort went to France and sent back to James some very interesting letters, which give a considerable insight into the malignity of the writer's nature and justify Tyrconnel's dislike of him. In one, a very long communication despatched from Saint-Germain after his first interviews with Louis, Louvois and others,

* In the following winter Charles O'Kelly (author of *Macariæ Excidium* and himself in full sympathy with the extreme Nationalists, whose cabal later raised its head against the viceroy) speaks of James acting "by the advice of Tyrconnel, or rather by his orders, for he was in effect the King of Ireland." He has previously called Tyrconnel "the darling of the nation."

he speaks of the satisfaction of the King and his ministers at his answers to certain charges made against King James, and professes to discover a plot. "On the main," he writes, "I found the calumnies to come from the Ambassador, Rosen, and some of the French officers on the one hand; and from a knot of Irish on the other, who reside here in Paris." The fountain of the Irish malice Melfort asserts to be one Bishop Malony,* who "declared he was entrusted at the Court of France by Duke Tyrconnel, and for the clergy and nobility of Ireland." This man "has a secret correspondence and access to the ministers . . . to whom he shows letters from Ireland of a most abominable strain; especially three (after which I now hunt), wherein the great things done in that kingdom before Your Majesty's coming there are fully set out; and how you had, by the advice of ill councillors, ruined all the good order you found in it, and hindered Duke Tyrconnel's designs." Melfort presses the King to punish the writer of one of the worst of the letters (which Queen Mary will forward), if he can be found, together with his accomplices. The chief culprit, it appears from subsequent reports, is Sir Neil O'Neil; but almost all the Irish in Paris are among the accomplices, according to Melfort, "all having seen, carried

* John Moloney, Roman Catholic Bishop of Killaloe, whom O'Callaghan in his edition of *Macariæ Excidium* calls "one of the most *ultra* of the Irish political characters of those times." He is the author of the curious letter to Tyrrel which King printed in the Appendix to his *State of the Protestants*, pp. 353-65.

copies of, or trumpeted about the contents of these letters."

In another letter, also sent from Saint-Germain in October, Melfort especially attacks d'Avaux and the Duchess of Tyrconnel, about whom he uses a phrase which has become celebrated through its frequent quotation by historians. He begins with d'Avaux:

"In the first place, he says that all things now go well since I was sent away; that all the Irishmen have another heart since they saw my Lord Tyrconnel with them; and that it is evidently seen the prejudice I did to Your Majesty's affairs. . . . Mr. de Lauzun is to go over [in place of Roze], and I am afraid that he and the Ambassador will not agree long together. This will draw in my Lady, and consequently my Lord Tyrconnel, and there will be a war in your own Court, which I fled hither to shun. . . . He [d'Avaux] ought to be recalled, for the quiet of your affairs. He could not agree with one who submitted to him [Roze]. How will he with one who will not yield an ace, nor let him meddle with French troops pay or preferment? This I see is the other's temper, and I dread the consequences. There is one other thing, if it could be effectuate, were of infinite use; which is the getting of the Duchess of Tyrconnel, for her health, to come into France. I did not know she had been so well known here as she is; but the terms they give her, and which, for your service, I may repeat unto you, is that she has *l'âme la plus noire que se puisse*

*concevoir.** I think it would help to keep that peace, so necessary for you, and prevent that caballing humour, which has very ill effects. These things I write, not for the outward appearance, but because there is a secret spring at bottom I confess I like not; and that on two accounts. First, it is said, Churchill has more influence in that matter, and this I believe not, except she have sent her money into England. But the second is another thing, the keeping up a correspondence here, the bottom whereof I will not understand; first, by herself with Mr Courtin and by him; and secondly, by the nephew with the Irish here, who begin to have discourses of the freedom of the nation. I must not repeat, but Your Majesty must prevent, lest it come too late, by putting it out of the power of any one family to make Ireland change a master. . . . The person who carries on the design here is Bishop Malony, and it is plainly a faction of almost all the Irish to lay all blame at your door and to applaud Tyrconnel; not that they care for him, otherwise than that he is Irish. They say openly,

* This exceedingly strong expression appears to have puzzled some who have met with it and to have led them to suppose that the writer must have had some grounds for what he says. But Melfort was not the man to stick at attributing to others what he thought himself. The secret of his extreme bitterness towards Frances may be discovered in a letter which he sent from Rome in October, 1690, to Father Maxwell in Ireland: "I think his [Tyrconnel's] Dutchess robbing in a manner Irlande of so much money, and pretending it was the King's, should be no great commendation. But she is of the number of the fortunat may doe what they please and shall be better looked on than others, whatever their services are." (Melfort's MS. correspondence in the British Museum, *Lansdowne MSS.*)

that no man is to be trusted but the Irish; and that now is the time to play their game or never. . . . There is an absolute necessity to call over to Ireland this Bishop Malony; for he is not what he ought to be. His correspondent, for that letter, is Sir Neal O'Neal, nephew of my Lord Tyrconnel; and, if Your Majesty make not an example of him, all will pass for true he has sent; and one such action, judged by the council or judges, would put a stop to these stories here, if rightly used."

In November Melfort (against whose presence even at Saint-Germain it is not surprising to learn that the heads of the Royalist party in Ireland had strong objections) went to Rome. He was entrusted with a mission to the new Pope, Alexander VIII., from whom it was hoped to secure better treatment than Innocent XI. had accorded to King James. He did not cease his campaign of calumny, however. He sent his confessor, Father Maxwell, to Ireland to reinforce his written arguments, and gave him a paper of "Instructions" as to what he was to do and say. In one paragraph these words occur: "That the Duchess of Tyrconnel is a main instrument in carrying on this design [to defame the King and cry up the Irish], and keeps a constant correspondence with M. Courtin and, by him, with M. Louvois. That, for this reason, Bishop Malony stays here, and had the impudence to give one of these lybels to the Queen and to propose to her the having an Irish envoy at the

Court of France; he himself having the promise of Lord Clare* and others for their endeavours that he shall be the man."

Melfort, it may be seen, credits Frances both with great influence (or at least with great endeavours to use what influence she had) with the French ministers; and with exerting herself on behalf of the Irish, not the Royalist, cause. We may well believe that she strove to support her husband's appeals to France for more substantial assistance than had hitherto been furnished. But that she embraced the Nationalist view of the right policy for Ireland, it is impossible to accept. She was not on good terms with the extremists, indeed was cordially disliked by very many of them. Her personal interest would have been best served, had she not been a loyalist, by her husband's accommodation with the Prince of Orange, whereafter the Churchills no doubt could do something on her behalf. Viewing the matter on the lowest grounds, she stood to gain either by the restoration of James or by making terms with William. Why, then, should she intrigue in favour of those who wished to see an independent Ireland? Sir Neil O'Neil's attitude is explicable. Though a nephew of Tyrconnel, he was half a Celt, one whose family on the father's side had suffered heavily through Ireland's connection with England. He might well lend himself to plots of the discontented Irish of whom Melfort writes—and whom

* Daniel O'Brien, third Viscount Clare.

Melfort had done more than anyone else in his party to disgust. The necessity of working all together for the repeal of the Acts of Settlement had kept the Irish together. That necessity being removed, sectional differences began to make their appearance, and grew greater until they culminated in the deposition of Tyrconnel from his position as "darling of the nation" and an attempt to get rid of him entirely.

For the present, however, all went well with the Lord Deputy after his return to Dublin and the departure of Melfort. In the enthusiasm shown at his recovery from combined illness and chagrin, the fighting spirit of the army flamed up in such a way as to astonish d'Avaux, who hitherto had been as condemnatory as Roze of the native troops. New men came forward readily in answer to appeal, and the only lack was the old one, that arms and pay for them were to seek. Thanks to the industry of some of the competent officers whom Louis had sent over, the want of drill had been remedied among the recruits of longer standing. With better arms and the training of actual warfare they would have no doubt given earlier proof of the military worth which many of them were later to demonstrate so completely in the service of France.

Unfortunately for the cause in which they were now striving, they did not yet receive the experience of battlefields. We do not propose to follow King James's movements against Schomberg in the autumn

of 1689, while Tyrconnel remained behind at Dublin to continue his organisation of affairs. It must suffice to say that, having failed to draw William's marshal from his entrenchments at Dundalk during the second half of September and the whole of October, James in November ordered his army into winter quarters and returned himself to Dublin on the eighth of the month. The King would not attack Schomberg in his trenches, says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "fearing the victory would prove too dear, though General de Rosen, upon good grounds, was altogether for it, since they could not get the enemy to fight otherwise. And he took the King's refusal to attack the foe so ill that he resolved not to stay in the kingdom. His opinion was confirmed by several officers, who showed that the attempt was not so dangerous as it appeared at a distance." O'Kelly is indignant at the King's inaction and declares that he thereby "lost a fair opportunity of putting an end to the war of Ireland, and perhaps to that of England." At least it may be said that James lost the opportunity of giving his men what they most wanted. In his *Memoirs* he states that he decided to set out from Drogheda against Dundalk contrary to the advice of the French, who favoured a retreat on Athlone (involving the abandonment of Dublin and a dependence on the resources of Connaught), and only waited for the arrival at Drogheda of Tyrconnel. He continues: "The next day the Duke of Tyrconnel came up and gave the

King an account of the condition and number of his troops, and what he had left with Mr. Symon Lutterel, the Governor of Dublin; upon which His Majesty called the Ambassador and all the generall officers to consult what was fit to be done. The Duke of Tyrconnel and the rest of his own subjects were unanimously of his own opinion. The Duke, moreover, assured them there was not corn enough in Connock to subsist twenty thousand men two months; upon which the King resolved . . . to advance; . . . accordingly upon Holy Rood day, the 14th of September, they marched." He fails to explain satisfactorily why, finding Schomberg determined to remain strictly on the defensive, he declined, though in considerably superior force, to attack him, and so at least to give his men some seasoning in warfare. A few hours of the gallant young prince who fought under Turenne, Condé, and the Spanish generals in Flanders, might have achieved wonders. But life had crushed the spirit of the Duke of York out of the wearied body of King James. The unconvincing explanation of his conduct which he gives in his *Memoirs* seems to show he came to understand at Saint-Germain that he threw away a great chance at Dundalk in 1689. According to d'Avaux, Tyrconnel recognised this so completely at the time that he actually asked him whether he did not think it would be better for the King to go back to France.

The manner in which the winter of 1689-90 was

passed at Dublin gave the critics fresh cause for complaint. "The young commanders were in some haste to return to Dublin," says O'Kelly, "where the ladies expected them with great impatience. . . . And now the winter season, which should be employed in serious consultations and making the necessary preparations for the ensuing campaign, was idly spent in revels, in gaming, and other debauches unfit for a Catholic Court." An observer of a very different section of the Royalist party, the Englishman John Stevens, alludes to the satisfaction engendered by the non-success of Schomberg's invasion, and says: "This too great confidence of the good posture of our affairs produced in all men such a security as proved without doubt very prejudiciall to our interests in the end. Everyone, laying aside the care of the publick, wholly devoted himselfe either to his private affairs or to his pleasure and ease." He rails bitterly against the "debauchery, luxury, and riot," the drunkenness, blasphemy, gambling, &c., rife in Dublin. As yet a third writer on the same side, the author of the *Jacobite Narrative*, rather more than suggests that too much attention was given to various "fooleries," we must suppose the indictment true and that the discipline in the army this winter was very lax, whether or not it was as bad as it appeared to Stevens, who, although he admits that his own youth and lack of employment led him into excessive self-indulgence, was scarcely a man for the life of a garrison town.

But Tyrconnel evidently did not devote himself to the fooleries which attracted his juniors. A letter which he wrote to Queen Mary at Saint-Germain on December 12th (old style) shows him full of preparations for the future as well as anxious that the invasion of England should not be delayed any longer, provided that France would furnish adequate assistance.

"I cannot help repeating to Your Majesty," he says, "the trouble the King is in, as well as all of us, least the ministers there should hinder the French fleet from having directions to obey his orders, in order to the transporting of himself and his troopes into England at this time, the juncture being soe favorable at present that, if shipt [? slipt], perhaps in our days we may not see another, which if denyed, for my part I can attribut it to noe other cause than the little knowledge they have of the King's affaires, as well as that of those three kingdoms, for I can never think it is their want of good will. But certain it is, let their reason for it be what they please, they must necessarily see (as well as all the world) that the people of England were never in such a disposition to throw of the usurper and receive their own king as at this time, and that if time be given him he will by all sorts of ways and means establish his tyranny over those helpless people in one year's time more. I know, Madam, there is little need of layeing these things before you, since noebody sees more clearly into all these matters nor endeavours more to redress them

then yourself. Our want of the copper I writ formerly to you for is very great, that thing alone only being our support as to the payment of our army and all things else, for not a farthing of silver or gold is now to be seen in this whole nation. Judge by that of the necessity we are like to fall in whenever we want it. In a word it is our meat, drink and cloths, it is therefore that Your Majesty will be pleased to prepare another stock of copper for us before this that you are now a-sending us be spent, which will not last us above three months, our expence being above a hundred thousand pounds Stirl. a month, and the forty tun of copper you send will coin not above three hundred thousand pounds.

"In your last to me Your Majesty seemed to say that you were afraid that the memoir I sent you for the things we wanted would (if sent) take up so much of the mony designed us that little ready money would come to us after all those things were paid for. All which, Madam, is true, and was well considered here, for the King's intention was then, and still is that in the first place Your Majesty should get as much arms and ammunition as you could without paying for it, which I suppose is their own intention there; but for the other things, as linnen for shirts and all such things as will be applyed to cloth our men, it is but reasonable we should pay for, for tents I hope they will send without being paid for, but rather then want them we must be contented to pay for them, for these we cannot be possibly without.

"I pray, Madam, let 50 tuns of copper be sent us (besides the forty now a-coming) before the end of March, tho you pay for it, for we are undone whenever that mettle failes us, as I have often repeated, and tenn tunns of steel, for we begin now to make firearms here, without which we cannot work. Your Majesty cannot choose but be soe very knowing in all those kind of affaires that I believe the King need noe other factor then yourself, now that he has thought of turning merchant himself to exporte his own wooll and the other commodities of the growth of this kingdom.

"Pray God preserve you and your son."

This communication of Tyrconnel's to the Queen gives a picture of a man devoting himself to business with all his soul, and when we remember in connection with it the complaints of King James about the amount of work thrown on himself since Melfort's departure, we can only suppose that Tyrconnel was very badly served by his subordinates; that Melfort, in fact, was justified when he wrote to Mary later from Rome: "There is not one thing I stand so much in fear of as negligence in executing the King's orders."

During the winter Tyrconnel also took steps to disband again some of the regiments of recruits, presumably of those who had flocked to the standard in September in response to his call. O'Kelly alleges what we can hardly credit on his unsupported statement, that there were disbanded no less than "forty

newly-raised legions," mostly of the old Irish race, "for whom Tyrconnel seemed to have no great inclination, believing them more dangerous than William himself." If these men were the "poore country fellows" described by Stevens, mere rapparees who embraced the chance of plundering the countryside, then it must be admitted that the Lord Deputy had very good reason for dispensing with their services, little as such a step commended itself to such a perfervid Irishman as O'Kelly. Rapparees were not worth their pay, even in the copper of which Tyrconnel found the scarcity so irksome.

Among the troops kept in commission the general inactivity prevailing until the advent of spring had its bad effects, apart from the untimely revelling for which it gave the opportunity. Quarrels were common, as usual in an army of mixed nationalities, and it was only with difficulty that a duel was prevented between two such high officers as Tyrconnel's great-nephew Walter, colonel of his own regiment of dragoons, and the younger of the King's illegitimate sons, who, with the title of the Lord Grand Prior, led a regiment of infantry. D'Avaux declares Henry Fitz-James to have been "a very debauched young man, who gets drunk on brandy every day and was all the past summer, through his debauches, unfit to ride his horse." But d'Avaux at the best was full of prejudices, and was, when he wrote, very much out of love with his own position and all his associates, so that we need not

take him too seriously here; especially as Henry afterwards proved himself, if no peer of his brother, at least a very competent soldier. As on the present occasion Dongan provoked him by challenging him at a party to drink confusion to Melfort (for whom the Fitz-Jameses shared their father's esteem), it is not surprising that the boy of not yet seventeen years lost his temper, and after a heated dispute threw his glass in Dongan's face. The Irishman, however, was wise enough to allow himself to be persuaded to forget the insult.

Few incidents of a military character marked the passage of the winter months. The most stir was made by the escape from captivity of Lord Mountcashel, who had remained a prisoner at Enniskillen ever since the disaster of Newtown Butler. His exchange for Mountjoy had been proposed, but apparently Mountjoy was considered by the King's advisers too dangerous an enemy to be released from the Bastille. Now, on December 20th, Mountcashel "made his escape by artifice and came to Dublin," says the author of the *Jacobite Narrative*, seeming therefore to share the opinion of His Lordship's captors, who accused him of breaking his parole; though O'Kelly merely speaks of his evasion, "after a strange and wonderful manner, to the universal joy of all Ireland." Tyrconnel did not share this joy. He and his former second-in-command were no longer on good terms. James indeed says that "my Lord Montcassel . . . had always been [since his own arrival in Ireland, he must mean] of an

opposite party to my Lord Tyrconnel, and did all he could to thwart whatever he aimed at in that Court; which made the King's taske the more difficult." To ease the friction it was arranged that Mountcashel should be sent to France with the Irish troops who were to proceed thither in exchange for the French troops Louis had now at length promised in response to the repeated requests of James and Tyrconnel. "And, indeed," says O'Kelly (who of course takes the part of a brother Celt, especially "a peer of Ireland, lineally descended from the ancient Kings of Munster, . . . a man of parts and courage, wanting in no quality fit for a complete officer, if he were not somewhat short-sighted"), "Mountcashel, who could not endure Tyrconnel's haughty humour, was not displeased to go serve in France under the great King Louis XIV."

A couple of small raids were made by the Royalists, one of which resulted in a failure at Newry, in November, the other in the capture of Nenagh Castle in January. The latter place was held for Sir Thomas Newcomen, now turned traitor, by his second wife* and a small force, and surrendered on terms favourable to the garrison, who were allowed to go and join Schomberg with their arms still in their possession.

"Warlike Schomberg," O'Kelly says, "took the field early in the spring before Tyrconnel was awake, and reduced the Castle of Charlemont, the only place that

* The first, Tyrconnel's sister Frances, had died on February 17th, 1687.

held for James in the province of Ulster." The remark about Tyrconnel is entirely unjust; for, owing to the inactivity of the French fleet, supplies had arrived for Schomberg regularly throughout the winter, while at Dublin and the other quarters of the King's army they were woefully short, especially for the horses. Nor was Charlemont reduced until May 14th, whereas the Duke of Berwick and some of his colleagues were afield two months earlier. Operations on a large scale were delayed for a considerable time, it is true; but as in addition to the lack of stores there was the imminent change of the French commanders-in-chief to be considered, it is not remarkable that no great activity was displayed.

On March 14th the French reinforcements arrived at Kinsale from Brest. On board Admiral Gabaret's fleet of forty-one men-of-war and some subsidiary vessels were six regiments of the French army, numbering between six and seven thousand men; and, in addition, "three or four hundred Irish, some English and some French volunteers, with twenty-two pieces of cannon for the field, three hundred bombs of different sizes, six thousand grenades, a great quantity of ball of all sorts and of arms and of other necessaries for the King and for that particular brigade," according to the account in the *Jacobite Narrative*. In command of the troops came Antonin Nompar de Caumont, Comte de Lauzun, certainly not the most illustrious, but as certainly one of the most remarkable of the

friends of the Stuarts. A connection of the Gramonts, he owed his first introduction to Louis XIV. to the Marshal of that family. He was now about fifty-six years of age. His serio-comic history previous to 1688 need not detain us here. In the October of the year mentioned he requested leave from Louis XIV (in whose favour he then stood ill) to go to Whitehall, and ever afterwards was a devoted adherent of the cause of James and Mary. In the war-councils of the former at Salisbury he participated, to the disgust of the English. In the dramatic escape of the latter with her infant son to France, he was the prime assistant, entrusted by James with their care. Thanks to the intercession of his English friends he was reconciled to his own king, who nevertheless refused to send him as James's French commander-in-chief, partly because he had no opinion of his military talents, partly because his pretensions were too high. He was accordingly left behind in Paris, with a small compensation from James in the shape of a knighthood of the Garter.

Disgusted with Marshal Roze, the English King, when he sent Lord Dover to Versailles, again asked for the services of Lauzun. Queen Mary, whose belief in her rescuer's ability was excusable, strongly supported the request, and Louis consented both to recall Roze and to send Lauzun to Ireland. But the honour-craving nobleman nearly shipwrecked the scheme by his arrogance, as is described in a letter to James from one of his ministers—possibly Lord Waldegrave, his

From a mezzotint by J. Beckett, after a painting by N. de Largillière.

MARY OF MODENA, QUEEN OF JAMES II.

ambassador at Versailles, as well as husband of his natural daughter Henrietta. Having mentioned the decision to send for Roze out of Ireland. this letter continues :

" But I doubt much whether they are not sorry Lausun is sent in his place ; it being only yielded to (as I believe) because the King has writ so earnestly for him, and that many, who do not love him, are glad to send him out of the way. I have been told, by those who are most affectionate to the King's service, that whenever he had power, he has been so insupportably imperious and haughty that it was impossible to live with him ; and that, since he was so with his own master, it is to be feared he will be worse when he finds himself and the succours he commands necessary. Besides, it is so long since he has been in an army that he must have forgot much of the method of war ; and certainly his imprisonment and life since have taken away that vigour and activity necessary to command a raw army. He has showed so much ill-humour about this matter that I have almost fallen out with him about it. The first two or three days after Lord Dover's arrival, he told us that he would not go, unless he were made a duke. When he began to be cool enough to consider that such a capitulation would send him again to prison, he said he would go ; but told me, particularly, that, if there were a man to whom he wished the greatest plague he could invent, it should be to be in his circumstances and to be sent

into Ireland. That he was grown old, and desired quiet; and, instead of that, undertook a desperate business; only fit for somebody who had neither reputation, nor interest, nor quiet, nor anything else to lose. I believe no general in France but would have been ambitious to restore the King, and to venture their lives in such a cause."

Lauzun, if he did not now obtain his dukedom, at least was accorded the rank of Captain-General, which was before refused to him, together with a salary of fifty thousand livres a year. Louis decided also to give him d'Avaux's post as well as Roze's. Since James disliked both d'Avaux and Roze and cordially liked Lauzun, this was a ready solution of a difficult problem, though one which promised little good for the Royal cause. King Log had been substituted for two King Storks. Lauzun had nothing to commend him but his courteous manners, his personal courage, and his affection for the Stuarts.* Louis thought little of him, Louvois much that was bad, and their opinions were justified as against that of James. Lauzun's military incapacity was the finishing touch required to bring about the King's downfall in Ireland. Perhaps Roze would have failed equally had he remained as commander to the day of the Boyne; but his failure at least would

* From the many descriptions of him, including his kinsman Saint-Simon's, Lauzun was a little fair man, with a good figure and a noble and commanding face, though one lacking in charm. In character he was intensely ambitious, jealous, discontented, intriguing and malicious, unscrupulous in compassing his ends. In addition he was a wit, a gambler, and a gallant. His qualifications as courtier, therefore, are obvious.

have been due to the incompatibility of his rude nature with King James's, not to inertia and incompetence. Unhappily, it was not until too late that France sent St. Ruth to Ireland.

Little more than three weeks after Lauzun's arrival the French fleet started back from Cork, having on board d'Avaux, Roze, and the Irish regiments under Mountcashel who were to take the place of the French brought by Lauzun. Mountcashel led with him his own regiment, strengthened by new recruits to repair its heavy losses in the previous year; Lord Clare's, Colonel Henry Dillon's, Colonel Richard Butler's and Colonel Robert ("Beau") Feilding's. This force was inferior in numbers to the French, unarmed, and ill-clothed, and scarcely seems to have merited at this stage in its history its description by King James as containing some of the best Irish troops. Its subsequent doings on the Continent proved of what fine material it was composed; at present it was but raw. The fairness of the exchange of troops in the spring of 1690 is a question which has been much discussed both by contemporary writers and down to this day. On the face of it, the exchange looked in favour of James, who received more than six thousand men, armed and experienced in war, for less than six thousand, unarmed and inexperienced. But it must be confessed that the French troops did singularly little in Ireland, while Mountcashel's brigade was a most valuable asset to France in the future. Therefore James is not

so ungrateful as he seems when he grumbles at his bad bargain and says of Louvois, "that great and powerfull Minister did not concur in giveing such assistance as was in his power and might reasonably have been expected." Apart from the matter of value of the French aid now sent, there is no doubt as to Louvois's grudging assistance. He did not intend to give, and obtained Louis's consent that he should not give, more than sufficient to keep the struggle in Ireland going. He would do nothing to hinder the invasion of the country by the Prince of Orange, which might have been done by means of Gabaret's fleet, as James requested.

James was not ungrateful in thinking that, if he were worth assistance at all, he was worth assistance sufficient to restore him to his throne. Of course he did not understand the deep policy underlying the conduct toward him of Louvois and his master.* Had he

* In Clarke's *Life* (II., 387) occurs the statement, founded upon, though not directly quoted from the lost *Memoirs* of the King: ". . . The Army must either be transported out of Ireland, or all necessarys for its subsistance imported from France, as also an additional number of troops proportionable to the vast preparations England was makeing. But the Court of France seem'd deaf to all these representations. The French officers and Ambassador in Ireland had sent such disponding relations from thence that, tho they could not but see the great advantage of such a diversion, yet the improbability of success made them avers from ventring more succours than what was absolutely necessary to keep the war alive and that they might not seem wholy to abandon the King; about six thousand men therefore and some few cloaths for the soldiers were obtained at last, but as all things fell out cross and unlucky to the King, so in the choice he fortuned to make of a general to command them the minister [Louvois] was disobliged, which perhaps was the true reason those succours were dispensed with so spareing a hand."

understood, he would have had still less cause for gratitude than he showed. Tyrconnel was not as blind as the King. "We are only destined to serve a present turne," he wrote to Queen Mary, "and be at last a sacrifice to our ennemis." He did not succeed, however, in opening James's eyes to the selfishness of his allies

CHAPTER XII

THE BEGINNING OF THE END

THE simultaneous departure from Ireland of d'Avaux, Roze, and Mountcashel both strengthened the influence of Tyrconnel and led to more harmony in council. O'Kelly, an unwavering enemy of the Lord Deputy, is displeased with the result and attacks him and the King alike in the matter. According to *Macariæ Excidium*, James, knowing that he could not hope to be recalled to England while he headed an Irish or a French army, "like the dog in the fable, must let go the substance to snatch at the shadow. . . . It seems that neither his father's misfortunes nor his own late experiments could make him alter the good opinion he once conceived of the good affection of his English subjects, nor the unhappy resolution, which many believed he took, to lose Ireland in order to recover England. However, this grand design, communicated only to a few favourites, must be carried on so cleverly as not to be perceived by Louis XIV. or the old Irish; where-

upon James made it his business to get [d'Avaux and Roze*] both removed out of Ireland. . . . James and Tyrconnel, now left to themselves, had leisure to concert in private with those of the Cabal the fittest methods that could be taken to perfect their secret project. Lauzun was soon gained to be of their opinion, though we may reasonably suppose that the bottom of the design was not discovered to him, because it was so much against the interests of the King his master."

We have quoted so much from the pages of *Macariæ Excidium* because the view expressed here helps to explain the incipient revolt of the Nationalists against Tyrconnel. It is amusing to see that at the very period when Tyrconnel, according to O'Kelly, was concerting with King James and "those of the Cabal" —the Tyrconnel party, as we may now call it—plans of which Louis XIV. would have strongly disapproved, in England a very different idea of his conduct was entertained. "Wee heare from Ireland," says a letter written in London on March 28th, 1690, "that there are discontentes among the Irish about the measures of governing. Terconnell truckles under the King of France, but Colonel Searsfeld refuses so to doe, and each have partys dependant on them." Again, a newsletter in May avers, on the authority of advices from Dublin, that "there being high words betweene Tyrconnel and the French generals who should

* Roze, O'Kelly says, "could not be endured by Tyrconnel, in regard he was more knowing in the art of war than the Captain-General."

command the army, King James confined [that is, restrained] Tyrconnel, upon which the Irish conclude he favours the French, and declare they had rather goe over to the English than truckle to the French."

Yet a third divergent view of the situation may be seen in a letter written about the same time by Melani, one of the Tuscan representatives in Paris, to a friend in Florence. "It is greatly feared," he says, "that King James will meet with the same misfortune which befell him in England, and that he may find himself in Ireland abandoned by the greater part of his army. He is always hoping to be recalled by the English and treats them better than he does the Irish, who have always been faithful. This has a bad effect upon the Earl of Tyrconnel and the other Irish leaders."

Clearly Tyrconnel's circumspection was sufficient to make him a puzzle in Dublin and elsewhere. And, indeed, there was no less necessity for circumspection on his part after the change of French advisers than before. Lauzun was personally pleasing to King James and was eager to gratify his wishes. But he had come to Ireland with strict instructions from Louvois not to force the fighting, but to aim at wearing the invaders out. Although he could not disclose such an order to James or Tyrconnel, it must naturally have influenced his conduct from the outset. It is probable, however, that any early disagreement between him and Tyrconnel was occasioned (as is suggested by the

statement which we have quoted from the English newsletter above) by his claims to supreme command. We learn from Dangeau's *Journal* that an arrangement was made in May that when King James was with the army Tyrconnel was to rank second after him; otherwise Lauzun was to be in control.

Lauzun's pride brought him into conflict with Lord Dover on the very first day of his arrival. He had not met with a proper reception on landing, and therefore so violently attacked James's certainly very inefficient Intendant—"who probably was as ill qualified to fill the place of an intendant as the other of a general"—that the King, for the sake of peace, sent Dover into France. He returned at the end of March entrusted with letters from the Queen to her husband and to Tyrconnel;* but apparently the quarrel between

* Queen Mary's letter to Tyrconnel is very interesting as showing the esteem which she had come to feel for him. The main portion of it runs as follows: "This is my third letter since I heard from you, but shall not make it a long one, for the bearer of it knows a great deel of my mind, or rather all the thoughts of my heart, for I was so overjoyed to meet with one I durst speak freely to that I opened my heart to him and sayd mor than I am like to do again in haste to anybody. I therfor refer myself to him to tell you all wee spoke off, for I have no secrets from you; one thing only I must beg of you, to have a good care of the King, and not lett him be too much encouraged by the good news he will hear, for I dread nothing at this time but his going to fast into England, and in a manner disadvantageous to those of our persuasion. . . . Pray putt him often in mynd of beeing carefull of his person, if not for his own sake, for mine, my sonnes, and all our friends that are undon if anything amiss happenes to him. I dare not lett myself go upon this subject, I am to full of it; I know you love the King. I am sure you are my friend, and therefor I need say the lesse to you, but cannot end my letter without telling you that I never in my life had a truer nor a more sincere friendship for anybody than I have for you.

M. R."

The good news mentioned appears to be a plot for a Scottish rising.

him and Lauzun continued, for we next hear of the King granting him permission to proceed to England, with the result that he reconciled himself with the *de facto* government and took no further interest in the royal cause.

The former Harry Jermyn was scarcely a serious loss, but the overweening conceit of the French general which alienated him was an offence to men far worthier than he was. It did not alienate Tyrconnel, proud though he was himself in a different way from Lauzun. The genuine attachment of both to the King made them agree at least to live side by side at his Court and Council-board without open rupture.

Moreover, Lauzun was himself a sympathizer with some of the schemes which were cherished by the King and those whom O'Kelly calls his "evil counsellors." If he did not go so far as to wish to see James, contrary to Louis's intentions, on his way to invade Britain, at least he thought that a French fleet might very properly be sent to cut off the Prince of Orange either from landing or from his base after landing. But Louis and his ministers were deaf to appeals whether from James himself or from the Ambassador-General whom they had sent him; and consequently on June 14th the Prince of Orange landed at Carrickfergus with as little difficulty as Schomberg had landed at Bangor the previous August; and, to complete the similarity of the situations, he effected a junction with Schomberg as easily as the latter had done so with the Ulstermen.

Had Tyrconnel not been now "an old and infirm man," as his master describes him, it is impossible that the royalist army could have been caught in such a state of unpreparedness as it was in June, 1690. He had performed marvels in the preceding year, when it was necessary to stir up the Irish against Schomberg. But apparently he could not make a corresponding effort now in face of a far more serious danger. Or perhaps the explanation is that, his influence being on the wane with a large section of the nation, what effort he made was unsuccessful. The negligence which Melfort dreaded in the execution of orders was very apparent. James complains that the immense pains which he himself took to remedy the position of affairs were for the great part lost labour. There were scarcely any magazines for stores on the frontier of the territory in his possession, although they had been arranged for. Dublin was short of bread. The guns, ammunition, etc., brought by Lauzun still remained at Cork for want of carriages. And not more than eighteen thousand men were in an effective condition. The army had been ordered to meet at Dundalk in May,* but it came together very slowly and in insufficient

* It was during the assembling of the royal army in May that an incident occurred which stirred the wrath of John Stevens. Whether or not the Duchess of Tyrconnel was among the "Ladys" alluded to does not appear. Stevens was with his regiment at Drogheda, and writes: "Tuesday the 27th, though the weather was extream foule, with a continuall violent raine, all the foot were drawn out & kept at armes all day, only to satisfy the impertinent curiosity of some Ladys, who appeared in a coach towards evening, & whom we were commanded to receive with the same respects as are used to be paid

numbers to oppose the invaders on level terms. "These troops convened there," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "but not so many as should have met for the design; far too many regiments of foot were left in garrisons, and that to no purpose, as it happened afterwards, whereby the King's army which took the field proved much inferior to the host of the rebels."

James left Dublin on June 16th. According to Clarke's account, based on the *Memoirs*, he "only proposed to himself, since the inequality of numbers was so great, to try if by defending posts and rivers he could tire and waste the enemies' force, having experienced by the foregoing campaign that nothing could be more fatal to them than delays, tho his own universal wants made that a hard game to play too." In his own words, James "thought fit to advance with his troops as far as Dundalke and eat up the forrage there about, and preserve his own country behind him."

We shall pass over the operations preceding the Battle of the Boyne, in which Tyrconnel took no active part. It is even doubtful what precise attitude he

to the King, though there were few there who did not curse them in their harts and even some with loud voices. For although we were obliged to obey our superiours, who, as may appear by the course of our misfortunes, were generally better courtiers than souldiers, yet we could not but resent being fatigued a whole day at armes, when the rain ran through our cloths the most part of the time as if we had been kept standing in a river up to the necks, & had no retreat but our poor tents, nothing of the King's service or martiall discipline requiring this hardship to be imposed on us, but rather the drawing out of so many battalions of armed men in such unseasonable weather was to surprise the fortress of those (I doubt not overwell fortifyed) Ladys harts."

adopted in council. The King had taken the direction of military affairs entirely into his own hands, being quickly aware of Lauzun's incompetence in this respect. In pursuance of his plan of campaign he fell back, as the Prince of Orange advanced, first to Ardee, then to Drogheda, and then to the south bank of the Boyne. Here he decided to hazard a battle, because, as he writes, "if he did it not there, he must loos all without a stroke and be obliged to quit Dublin and all Munster and retire beyond the Shannon, and so be reduced to the Province of Conough, where, haveing no magazines, he could not subsist very long, it being the worst corn country in Ireland; besides his men seem'd desirous to fight, and being new raised would have been dishearten'd still to retire before the enemie and see all their country taken from them, without one blow for it, and by consequence be apt to disperse and give all for lost; they would have reproached the King with not trusting to their courage and have assured him of wonders had he but try'd them."

The extreme section of the Irish, encouraged by a successful skirmish at Four Mile Pass on June 22nd, had wished to fight at Dundalk. They were as anxious to try the fortune of war now. Tyrconnel's views expressed in September, 1689, of the hopelessness of retreat into Connaught, make it probable that he, too, if he approved of the retreat from Dundalk—as he must surely have done in face of a vastly superior army—at least considered it advisable to make a stand on the

last line of defence covering Dublin. The Duke of Berwick finds Tyrconnel (though he admired him) grown "heavy and timorous," but nowhere suggests that he exhibited cowardice. Not even Lord Macaulay denies him personal bravery. His policy was certainly Fabian after the King's departure from Ireland; a continuation, indeed, of James's plan of "defending rivers and posts." But he did not shrink from a fight where necessary; and if Dublin was to be saved a fight was necessary at the Boyne, where a river would cover the front of the weaker army.

King James puts the odds against him at more than two to one; he having not above twenty thousand men, in great measure newly raised, half disciplined, half armed, with a weak artillery, and the Prince of Orange between forty and fifty thousand, with a train of thirty pieces of great cannon. A present-day estimate puts the royal forces on the day of the Boyne at twenty-five thousand, with eighteen guns, of which only six took part in the battle; and their opponents at thirty-six thousand, with thirty guns.

That the King, with the population of all Ireland except the north-east corner on his side, should only have been able to oppose the invaders with such inferior numbers may seem a poor testimony to Tyrconnel's five years' work in Ireland. But in truth none but a military genius—and this we cannot pretend that Tyrconnel was—could have created a more efficient fighting force out of the material to hand with only

the resources which he had. The Prince of Orange, with his own treasury and generous support from his adherents in England, was able to lead into battle an army composed of English and Dutch, French and Irish Protestants, and Scandinavian and German mercenaries. Of James's army some five thousand men were supplied by Louis. The number of his Anglo-Scottish supporters is uncertain, but they were in any case nearly all officers. The remainder were Irish. A vastly larger body of Irishmen could have been put in the field, no doubt. But Tyrconnel did not believe in the value of rapparees, and all unprejudiced critics on his own side agreed with him. He could not pay or feed even his regulars, and it would have been madness to cumber their movements with a crowd of unarmed, starving banditti. In the work which he had done since he came to Ireland in 1685 he had not displayed genius; but he had at least shown faithfulness, energy, and prudence. There was perhaps, as has been suggested above, a slackening of effort, to whatever cause it may have been due, when the great crisis arrived with the landing of the Prince of Orange. But, in view of all that he had accomplished before, the blame cannot be laid on Tyrconnel that the King's army was unable to cope with the necessities of the situation.

CHAPTER XIII

THE BOYNE AND THE RETREAT TO LIMERICK

FEW historic struggles are more difficult to follow in detail than the Battle of the Boyne. There are many accounts, on both sides, but none of them gives a clear picture of the whole affair, nor do they all in conjunction enable us to time the various movements with any approach to accuracy. As the Boyne, however, was in no sense Tyrconnel's battle—though he bore himself very bravely in the thick of the actual fighting and did more than any others of the high officers in the royalist army to prolong the contest—we shall confine ourselves to a brief notice of the day's events. In Appendix F will be found the story of the battle preserved in John Stevens's manuscript *Journal* in the British Museum, which is probably unfamiliar to the great majority of readers. Stevens himself, as an officer in the Grand Prior's regiment, took no part in the hand-to-hand work, but he was in a position to appreciate the feelings of the bulk of

his colleagues in the mismanaged action, where so large a proportion of the inferior force never threw its weight into the scale at all.

In the retreat from Dundalk before the advancing Prince of Orange, the Royalists reached Drogheda on Saturday, June 28th (old style), and at midnight received orders to strike tents, send away their baggage, and stand at arms. No enemy appeared, however, and at daybreak on Sunday the crossing of the Boyne was begun. To Stevens the design appeared to be to make good the passes of the river until reinforcements should arrive or the enemy, being short of provisions, should be compelled to fight at a disadvantage. At an early hour on Monday the hostile army appeared on the high ground north of the Boyne, and a small artillery duel took place, with little damage to either party. Very early on Tuesday, July 1st (in accordance with a war-council on the previous evening), preparations were made for a further retreat, the baggage being sent on the road south and the tents taken down, though not actually despatched with the baggage, but carried with the army. News had arrived that the enemy had defeated a regiment of Irish dragoons—Sir Neil O'Neil's—which guarded the bridge of Slane and the adjacent ford of Rossnaree higher up the river; and they could now be seen moving in force in that direction. The Royalists moved westward also, on the south bank, so as to check the outflanking movement.

"We continued," says Stevens, "marching along the river till, comming in sight of the enemy, who had passed it and were drawing up, we marched off to the left, as well to leave ground for them that followed to draw up as to extend our line equall with theirs, and finding them still stretching out towards their right we held on our march to the left."

This manœuvre on the part of James points to an adherence to the design guessed by Stevens. He was endeavouring to contain the Prince's army temporarily and to hold the line of the river, keeping the advantage of ground for his own inferior numbers. At the same time the retirement of the baggage towards Dublin shows that it was expected that the Boyne could not be held for long. With the baggage went two-thirds of the total artillery—a move inexplicable except on the supposition that Lauzun, whose only object seems to have been to "cut losses," insisted that his master's property should be saved from possible capture. James was reaping the harvest of his folly in asking for the services of a courtier in place of a general.

The extension of the troops toward the left, where at first there was no more than the one regiment of dragoons under Tyrconnel's nephew O'Neil, though necessitated by the outflanking movement of the enemy's right under Meinhart Schomberg, the Marshal's son, rendered the royalist position on the

right perilously weak. The ford at Oldbridge was guarded, for a time, only by the two infantry regiments of Antrim and Clanricarde. Against them advanced the whole of William's centre, commanded by Schomberg senior. Still farther down the river William himself, with the bulk of his cavalry, made for the ford of Donore, watched by Walter Dongan and his dragoons.

James acted on the assumption (which was doubtless correct) that a disaster on his left would be fatal. Young Schomberg having forced the ford of Rossnaree, where O'Neil received a mortal wound, "no sooner had the enemie passed there but they stretched out their line to the right, as if they designed to take us in the flank or get between us and Dublin." The King thereon "went to the right to hasten up the troops to follow Lausune, believing the main body of the enemie's army was following their right." But he found that Tyrconnel, whom he had left behind, had reinforced the small force at Oldbridge, and was now hard pressed. He had brought up five more regiments of foot under Richard Hamilton, in the attempt to keep back Marshal Schomberg, and was himself waiting with all the cavalry at his disposal to attack the enemy when the opportunity for a charge should occur. James therefore decided to leave Tyrconnel where he was, and returned to the left with the reserves only. He remarks that the cannon and baggage were not far enough advanced yet on the road to Dublin;

whence it is evident that he and Lauzun had resolved to retreat had it been possible to withdraw Tyrconnel from Oldbridge without thereby provoking immediate pursuit.

The royalist left and the enemy's right, being about equal in strength, treated one another with respect and avoided a serious encounter. Young Schomberg continued his endeavour to turn his opponents' flank, while they contented themselves with preventing this until, in James's words, "the right wing's being beat was no longer a mistery," and then retreat was postponed no longer.

The right wing had failed to achieve its impossible task. Walter Dongan had been killed at the head of his regiment, in a vain effort to prevent the Prince of Orange from crossing by the ford of Donore, and his men had scattered. The seven foot regiments at Oldbridge had been similarly unable to check Marshal Schomberg's passage and were in danger of being cut off from the main army—"which," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "the Duke of Tyrconnel, from the right, perceiving, flew with his regiment of horse to their rescue, as did the Duke of Berwick with the two troops of the [horse] guards, as did Colonel Parker with his regiment of horse, and Colonel Sutherland with his." The same writer continues: "It was Tyrconnel's fortune to charge first the blue [Solmes's] regiment of foot-guards to the Prince of Orange, and he pierced through. He presently after engaged the Enniskillen

horse, bold troopers. At the same time the two troops of guards and the other two regiments of Irish horse signalized themselves and were bravely opposed by the enemy. This gave opportunity to the King's infantry to get off safely."

Stevens is less complimentary to the cavalry. He admits the "unspeakable bravery" of some of them, but states that when they were overpowered—as they were bound to be ultimately by the immense superiority of numbers against them—they fled towards the left and "broke the whole line of the foot, riding over all our battalions." It appears, from what he says later, that he accuses them of riding over the first line of infantry, not merely those regiments to the left which had taken no part in the fighting through being removed from the right wing earlier in the day; though these too came in for the shattering impact of the flying horsemen. Other accounts would make it seem that the infantry at Oldbridge were already well beaten and had lost their leader, Richard Hamilton, wounded and a prisoner in the hands of the foe, before the rout of the cavalry took place. But in any case it is not denied that the mounted men made a gallant attempt to retrieve the fortunes of the day and "were outdone," as Stevens says, "by numbers not by valour." As for Tyrconnel, at the age of sixty and, according to Macaulay, a physical wreck several years earlier, he had headed cavalry charges in a way which would have reflected the utmost credit on a man half his age. He

at least incurred no dishonour at the Battle of the Boyne. Had all had the courage shown by him, by his nephew and grand-nephew, who both came by their death that day, the result would have been, if not different in the main, at least very different in its details.

Owing to the generalship which left less than six thousand men at Oldbridge to fight against about fifteen thousand, the royalist right was smashed up and driven off the field, though the French officer La Houguette states, in contradiction to Stevens, that Tyrconnel retired "in good order." The same generalship had preserved untouched the left wing, including between five and six thousand French veterans, who up to the time when the battle was decided might as well never have been there. On the retreat the French at last proved of use. Stevens does them full justice, in fact rather more than justice in comparison with the Irish. "Only the French," he writes, "can be said to have rallyed, for only they made head against the enemy and a most honourable retreat, bringing off their cannon and marching in very good order after sustaining the shock of the enemy, who thereupon made a halt, not only to the honour of the French, but the preservation of the rest of the scattered army. Nor ought any part of this glory to be attributed to the Count de Lausun or La Hougette, who at first left their men, but only to the valour and conduct of Monsr Sorlobe [Zurlauben], Coll. of the Blew

Regiment, who with unparalleled bravery headed and brought off his men, whereas the other two fled." On the next page he admits that "some of our horse" stood with the French; and Zurlauben in his report expressly associates the Irish cavalry with his men in the successful attempt to cover the retreat.

The two wings, whose share in the fighting had been so different, met at Duleek, in the rear of their positions earlier in the day, and, thanks to the firm attitude of Zurlauben and his mounted allies, they made good their retirement to Dublin pursued by no enemy. Marshal Schomberg's death at the hands of an Irish guardsman near the village of Oldbridge and the opposition offered at Duleek apparently cooled the eagerness of the Prince of Orange to follow up his victory.

The King had left for Dublin before the two sections of his army made their junction at Duleek. His *Memoirs* state that he yielded to Lauzun's reiterated representations that he should ride off with some cavalry and dragoons to secure the capital before the enemy, who were so much stronger in horse, should be able to do so, and was just out of the defile of Duleek when Tyrconnel joined the French. He rode on straight to Dublin* and there "spoke singly with those

* The story is famous, though its ultimate source of authority is doubtful, of the exchange of sarcasms between King James and the Duchess of Tyrconnel when she met him on his arrival at the Castle. He is said to have told her that the Irish had run well, whereat she retorted that he seemed to have beaten them. *Si non è vero, è ben trovato.*

of his Privy Council whom he trusted most" about the plan which Lauzun had urged on him of proceeding at once to France. The Councillors all were of opinion he should lose no time in doing so, since at present he ran a great risk of being taken by the enemy, who they believed would be there the following day. Next morning "Mr. Taaf, the Duke of Tyrconnel's chaplain (a very honest and discreet clergie man), came from him to press the King to leave Dublin and get into France as soon as ever he could, and to send all the troops in town immediately to meet him and Monsr de Lausun at Leslip [Leixlip], whither he was marching with all what he had left, not designing to come into Dublin at all, for fear he should not get his tired troops soon enough out of it again. Accordingly the King order'd Simon Lutterel to march to Leslip with all the forces in the town except two troops of the King's own regiment of hors, which he kept to attend upon himself, who in complyance to the advice of all his friends resolved to go for France and try to doe something more efectual on that side than he could hope from so shatter'd and dishearten'd a body of men as now remain'd in Ireland."

On July 4th James sailed from Kinsale harbour with a small flotilla of French ships sent over by his anxious wife on the chance of their proving of use to him. Before he went on board, according to his own account, he wrote to Tyrconnel (whom he had not seen since the meeting at Oldbridge) that he was going to France

pursuant to his, Lauzun's, and the rest of his friends' advice, hoping to send them thence considerable succours. In Clarke's *Life* the King's defence of his conduct, so far as it concerns Tyrconnel, is stated as follows :

"As the actions of the unfortunate are always censured more ways than one, so as some blamed the King for hazarding too much, others did it for his not hazarding more and quitting Ireland so soon. That counsel was no doubt too precipitate, and it is wonderful on what grounds my Lord Tyrconnel thought fit to press it with so much earnestness, unless it was out of tenderness to the Queen, who he perceived was so apprehensive of the King's person as to be in a continual agony about it ; she had frequently begged of him to have a special care of the King's safety and tould him he must not wonder at her repeated instances on that head, for unless he saw her heart he could not imagine the torment it suffered on that account and must always continue to do so, let things go as they would ; and owned afterwards . . . that, had she heard of the loss of the battle before that of the King's arrival, she knew not what would have become of her, and therefore acknowledged it none of the least obligations to him and Monsr Lausun for pressing His Majesty to it."

James asserts that only a scheme which he had of invading England and Scotland with Louis's aid, during the absence of the Prince of Orange, made him listen to his advisers ; and in the disillusionment of

after-years it is not to be wondered at that he finds those to blame that persuaded him to leave Ireland when he did not thereby gain England and Scotland. Yet it can hardly be doubted that, apart from any question of consideration for the Queen's tender heart, Tyrconnel did right in supporting the advice that James should go. The royalist cause was not yet dead in Ireland, but it was hopeless unless the King could find the means of striking a blow in another quarter. His presence could do nothing to sustain a guerilla war or a few sieges, and his capture would ruin all. Therefore the quicker he was out of harm's way the better.

As soon as it was ascertained that the King had left Dublin—perhaps the "discreet clergie man" brought the news back to Leixlip—Tyrconnel pressed forward vigorously with the retreat which had been decided upon into Connaught. Bad a country for defence as he had always declared Connaught to be previously, he had now no alternative. It was impossible to hold unfortified Dublin with a beaten army, in the midst, moreover, of a largely hostile population, and Limerick had the obvious advantage over the remaining royalist strongholds that it was far removed from the invaders' base. Orders were accordingly sent for the remains of the army to make for Limerick; "each colonel," says Berwick, "being charged to lead his regiment thither how he might think fit." O'Kelly finds it "admirable how every individual person, both officer

and soldier, came thither without any orders, and even without the conduct of any of their chief commanders, as if they had been all guided to Limerick by some secret instinct of nature." Nevertheless it was no secret instinct of nature, but Tyrconnel's command, which sent them to Limerick. He himself only spent sufficient time in the capital to take up his family and then made for Connaught.

A graphic account is given by the author of *Villare Hibernicum*, a partisan of the Prince of Orange, of the state of panic prevailing in Dublin on the day following the Boyne. "All this day, being Wednesday," he says, "nothing was to be seen in Dublin, but officers and carriages, and the principal persons of the town, their wives and families going away; others coming in dusty and weary, getting away as fast as they could. About four in the afternoon the Protestants were affrighted with the appearance of the Irish horse, which were drawn out of the city early in the morning, and which they hop'd had been quite gone, entering into the town, followed by the French and Irish foot in a full body; but they only marched through the town to go farther. The militia that kept the city followed them, only the Gouvernour remained. At last he resolved to march also, and to drive two or three hundred of the principal prisoners before him; but while they were preparing for this, a false allarm was spread that a party of English, being landed at the Harbour, were just at the town's-end. It was too

dusky to disprove this by view, and they had not leasure to send a messenger, but in hast shifted for themselves."

John Stevens was one of those who made the retreat on Limerick by way of Dublin, and his *Journal* furnishes the best picture of it, with an occasional glimpse of Tyrconnel himself on the route. His regiment was among those which had been scattered to the winds in the flight from the Boyne, and he describes it as being reduced at one time to six musketeers, eight pikemen, four ensigns, another lieutenant and himself—the temporary representatives of eight hundred men on the morning of the battle. They travelled how they could, with no attempt at military discipline. At Naas, the first town after Dublin, Stevens fell in with an ensign who had a lame horse. This poor mount brought them to Kilcullen on the night of July 2nd, and here they found a bed. Rising at break of day, they proceeded five or six miles, sharing the horse between them, when they "were overtaken by the Duke of Tyrconnel and his famely, some whereof challenged the horse, and indeed he had the King's mark; they being too strong for us to cope with, for then might was the greatest right, they carried him away, leaving us afoot, weary, and without friends or mony."

On the 4th the two travellers reached Kilkenny in time to witness a remarkable scene: "All the shops and public houses in the town were shut, and neither

meat nor drink to be had, though many were fainting through want and weariness. Hunger and thirst put me forward to seek releife, where nothing but necessity could have carryed me; but the invincible power of want hides all blushes, so hearing the stores at the Castle were broke up, and much bread and drink given out, I resolved to try my fortune there and found drink carryed out in pailes, and many of the rabble drunk with what they had got; yet upon my approach I perceived some officers, whom want had carryed thither as well as me but were somewhat more forward, so ill-treated by Brigadier Mackay first, and next by the Duke of Tyrconnel, who gave a Lieut. a thrust on the breast with his cane, that I went away resolved rather to perish than run the hazard of being ill used."

On July 6th, the day on which the Prince of Orange made his entry into Dublin, Tyrconnel reached Limerick. Stevens preceded him, and mentions finding assembled at a small village five miles away, which he calls Carrigenlish, "a great number of country people armed with roperies to receive the Duke."

The new headquarters having been safely reached, Tyrconnel set to work to reconstitute the army, of which a large proportion had been reduced to a disorderly mob, part unclothed, part unarmed, as it streamed across from the East to the West coast of Ireland. The retreat had been as disastrous, even to the troops which had been mere spectators at the

Boyne, as a hard-fought battle would have been. Stevens represents the condition of his own regiment as typical. It was reviewed on July 14th and was found to consist, at the moment, of one hundred and fifty armed men, fifty with damaged weapons, and a hundred with none at all. The way in which the men had thrown away their arms excited great and natural indignation, seeing how hard it had been to procure them before the Boyne. "It was proposed and threatened," writes Stevens, "to shoot some of the unarmed men for an example to terrify others from throwing away their arms, but the number being so very great it was only declared to them how well they had deserved to dye."

A very wise decision, for there was certainly not so much harmony in the royalist forces now that it would have been safe to exasperate the men by the old-fashioned military punishment of decimation. But the officers were ordered to take measures to put their regiments on a war-footing again, and discipline was strictly enforced where possible—the lack of provisions rendering it difficult to prevent the hungry from plundering.

Besides restoring the semblance of an army to the crowd of fugitives under their command, Tyrconnel and the French leaders (whose military experience here, at least, stood them in good stead) busied themselves with preparing Limerick for a siege, and we have the testimony of Stevens that they were thorough

in their work, to the point of ruthlessness, devastating the neighbourhood in their efforts to make the town defensible. The wiseacre Lauzun is said to have declared that Limerick could be reduced by a bombardment of roasted apples. Fortunately his subordinates, or some of them at least, knew something about sieges, as the event proved full well.

CHAPTER XIV

PLOTS AND CHARGES

IN the early days of the royal forces' reassembly at Limerick there broke out the first active revolt of the Nationalists against the authority of Tyrconnel. The shame engendered by the disaster of July 1st was manifested, in a large section of the Celtic officers of the defeated army, by a fierce indignation against their French colleagues and all others whom, rightly or wrongly, they considered responsible for what had happened. Against no one (except, perhaps Lauzun) did they feel a bitterer grudge than against Tyrconnel, little as he deserved their anger in connection with the Boyne; and their weariness of his authority, which had long been growing, was now complete. Stevens's *Journal* gives a very full account of the beginning of the conspiracy, and as he is a neutral witness and this portion of his manuscript has never, within our knowledge, been published before, we do not hesitate to reproduce it in full.

"This day," he writes, "was to have been put in execution a design before projected and contrived by some of our most active officers, but that accidentally discovered to and prevented by His Grace the Duke of Tyrconnell, which was thus. A councill being held by the Duke and other leading men to consult what was to be done in this desperate state of our affairs, His Grace was of opinion all was lost, and therefore thought convenient to make the best conditions with the enemy and surrender before it was too late. This advice was so far from being approved that it moved much indignation in some of the hearers, and that with just cause, and it was unanimously resolved to suffer the utmost extremities rather than submit to the Usurper, and to hold out what was left to the last. Hereupon the Duke, thinking it impossible to keep the field, and running from one dangerous extream to another no less prejudiciall, declared himself for ham-stringing all the horses, and bringing the men with what provisions could be gathered into the garrisons, a proposall no less dangerous in the consequency if followed then cruell in the execution. These opinions caused great heats and animosities, all men in generall exclaiming against them, and those in particular who were of a contrary faction to the Duke laying hold of this opportunity to make him odious to the army, and if possible to remove him from the government, as was afterwards attempted by sending Commissioners into France to that effect. The Duke being thus

lessened in the public esteem, though he retained the character and all orders run in his name as Ld.-Lieut., yet was there not the due subordination to him, and many private Cabals were held not only without his knowledge, but to oppose his authority, and among the rest this whereof I now speak. It consisted of many field officers of the contrary faction to the Duke, among others the Lutterels, the Oneals; and, though inferior in post, Connell, then Lieut.-Coll. to the Ld. Slane, had a principal part as being a young, active man and well beloved among the foot. They, finding that the French intended to leave us and embarque themselves and their cannon for France, and considering that thereby we were not only weakened in men, whereof they feared not so much the want, but in so many good arms at that time so scarce among us: the French being then quartered in the city, and the Irish forces encamped [outside] as was said before, they agreed on this day to send orders to the camp as from the Duke of Tyrconnell, though unknown to him, for the force to march to Limerick, in appearance as if to march through and encamp on the other side, but, the officers privy to the design being ready, they should suffer all to march in till such time they had filled all the streets, and, the French not suspecting any design in them, but being dispersed and unarmed, they were on a sudden, upon a sign given, to seize the gates of the city and then by beat of drum to command the French to march out, leaving their arms behind

them, and not suffer them anywhere to come to a head with arms, but thus naked to ship them with all convenient speed for France, and distribute their arms among our men that wanted. This project was carryed on with such secrecy and so well laid it had certainly taken effect, had not one of the managers ignorantly, as thinking him a party, opened it to the then Coll., after Major-Gen[l] Mark Talbot, who, having got an inkling, soon dived to the bottom of the contrivance, and immediately made it known to the Duke of Tyrconnell, who found no difficulty to break all their measures, though he caused the army to march as they had designed, but he parted the managers, and they, finding themselves discovered, had no opportunity to execute their design. The Duke showed much prudence in this action, for though he prevented the execution, he would not seem to know anything of the design; and it was so husht that it never came to the knowledge of many, which was a great happiness, for, had the French been sensible of any such attempts, it might have proved fatall both to them and us."

Tyrconnel had defeated and "husht," as Stevens says, this part of the plot. But it was far from ending here. Both *Macariæ Excidium* and Marshal Berwick's *Memoirs* give details of its continuation. O'Kelly is indignant over the scheme, which he attributes to the cabinet at the head of affairs—Tyrconnel's and Lauzun's are the only names he mentions—of

hastening the collapse of Ireland so that they might get away quickly. The two were surprised at the Limerick gathering, he says, Tyrconnel being concerned lest a sudden rally of the Irish might delay the execution of the scheme and Lauzun lest his pessimistic reports to Paris should be proved false. "So that these two great men, being of one resolution, though for different ends, were linked together in a friendship which promised to be everlasting. Lauzun longed so much to be back in his own country that he could not endure to hear of prolonging the war in Ireland. . . . Tyrconnel nourished this humour because it favoured his design not to oppose William in the conquest of Ireland. For the more speedy effecting that work he omitted nothing that might encourage William to advance and discourage the Irish to resist."

O'Kelly goes on to say that a council met at Limerick one day when Tyrconnel was absent and decided to send two envoys to Louis, pressing for aid and asking that Sarsfield—"the darling of the army"—should be appointed second-in-command to Tyrconnel. The last-named, on his return to the town, heard of what had happened, stated that the prerogative of sending envoys was his, and refused to hear of Sarsfield's preferment. Sarsfield's friends then proposed to "lay Tyrconnel aside"; but he himself would not agree to this. He "either wanted resolution to go on with so great an undertaking (though no man doubted of his personal courage), or perhaps did not think it

justifiable in him to depose the Viceroy of Ireland and enter into a new association without the King's authority."

This is O'Kelly's statement. Berwick, however, puts Sarsfield's conduct in an unfavourable light. He relates as follows the manner in which the malcontents approached him and his reception of their proposal: "The Duke of Tyrconnel having become again Viceroy of Ireland on the King's retreat, [Brigadier Henry] Luttrel ceased not to speak against Tyrconnel and to excite everyone against him. He was so well able to stir up the chief men of the nation that one day Sarsfield came to me on their behalf, and, after having bound me to secrecy, told me that, being convinced of Tyrconnel's treachery, they had resolved to arrest him, and therefore he proposed to me, on their behalf, that I should take on me the government of the Kingdom. My reply was brief: I told him that I was astonished they should make such a proposal to me, that all which might be done against the Viceroy was a crime of high treason, and that in consequence, if they did not cease to cabal, I should be their enemy and should warn the King and Tyrconnel. My words made an impression and prevented the execution of their plans."

James, we have seen, only makes his farewell letter to Tyrconnel from Kinsale mention that in going to France he was hopeful of sending considerable succours thence to Ireland. It was generally assumed, however,

that, in the words of the *Jacobite Narrative*, he also empowered him "to use his discretion, either to make peace with the Prince of Orange or continue the war." He admits himself that after reaching Paris and fruitlessly begging more aid from Louis he accorded his deputy a free hand in Ireland. "His Most Christian Majesty gave all for lost in that kingdom, sayd it would be so much throwne away to send anything thither, and therefore all he thought fit to doe was to dispatch some empty shipps to bring away his troops and such as would come along with them; so that in conformety to this the King was forced to send an order to My Lord Tyrconnel to come away himself too if he judged it proper, and either name a commander-in-chief at his departure and bring with him as many as were willing to accompany him, or otherwise to make conditions for their remaining if they rather chose that."

By the time that the King's letter to this effect reached him, Tyrconnel was at Galway. The Prince of Orange, having secured the submission of Drogheda, Wexford, Duncannon, Kilkenny, and Waterford, marched slowly on Limerick; making no great haste, comments the hate-blinded O'Kelly, "to give Tyrconnel the more time for compassing his design to bring the Irish to a general condescension for a treaty." The Viceroy did not wait for him, but putting the command of Limerick in the hands of Boisseleau, the French officer who had done such excellent work in training the Irish recruits at Cork

in the previous year, and leaving him about ten thousand native troops, himself went to Galway with Lauzun, the French regiments—to the great satisfaction of all Limerick, says Stevens—and the remainder of the army. Here, according to O'Kelly, he convened all the general officers and produced the King's letter, which he made known to them under seal of secrecy. Some of his own adherents expressed a wish to leave Ireland. But Sarsfield asserted that the letter was grounded on a misapprehension of the state of affairs; that "if the King were rightly informed how the case stood in Ireland, where they had a considerable army resolute to the last man, and how feasable it was to defend that part of the kingdom which lies between the river Shannon and the sea, His Majesty would, instead of inviting them to leave the country, rather encourage them to stay and defend it; and that, for his part, he was resolved not to be imposed upon by any such artifice to abandon his country or the King's interest in Ireland." Most of the colonels present supported Sarsfield, and so Tyrconnel was forced to drop the proposal to depart.

O'Kelly gives the anti-Tyrconnelite story throughout. The *Jacobite Narrative* is much fairer. Its author defines Tyrconnel's standpoint as follows: "His Grace had a discretionary power left him by the King, to make peace or continue war, as he should see it most conducing to His Majesty's interest and his loyal people's welfare. Upon which he considers thus with

himself: at Dublin two years before he was for a war, and was the principal author of raising that great army beforementioned, in order to reinthrone the King. He was then encouraged to it by the assurance of having His Majesty soon in Ireland; by the expectation of seeing a sufficiency of money brought from abroad; by the hopes of having reinforcements of trained men out of France; by a strong probability of having thereupon good success, and by other motives. But now, for different reasons, he changes his first opinion. His Excellency observed that the great army at first raised was disbanded to almost the moiety; . . . that the King returned to France; that the French brigade was going away; that the brass money, which hitherto had been the support of the army, was brought to no value; that there were no stores or provisions; . . . that Limerick was a very weak town, yet was their defence against the enemy; . . . that the Most Christian monarch was not in a state to send them competent aids; . . . that, in fine, it was not prudence in the abovesaid circumstances, and by a strained undertaking to run the risk of destroying the lives of the people, the expectations of their estates and the hopes of enjoying their religion."

But "the factioneers must have their will, and on they will go with the war," while Tyrconnel, "finding that he could not get a concurrence to his design of making a peace," prepared to continue the hopeless struggle—hopeless as he knew it to be and his master

also knew. On August 10th/20th, James wrote a letter to Lauzun in which he declared himself fully sensible of the dangers of his and Tyrconnel's position. But all his efforts on their behalf had been in vain. On the previous day he had been at Versailles, and was denied the fleet which he wanted sent to cut off the return across St. George's Channel of the Prince of Orange. Nor could he make any progress with his own scheme of invading England while the Prince was absent and only ten thousand regular troops were in the country. "So here is the best chance in the world lost, and I fear that France will not command the sea in the coming year, and in the meanwhile here is Ireland lost, and all my friends in England and Scotland."

After Louis sent his order to Lauzun to bring back his regiments to France, Tyrconnel had gone to Galway with the intention of arranging for their embarkation there. An empty fleet under Admiral d'Amfreville had come to fetch them, but that officer had consented, at Lauzun's and Tyrconnel's* joint request, to await the end of the siege of Limerick before he started for Brest. The Prince of Orange invested Limerick on August 9th. On August 30th he abandoned it in disgust, unable to reduce it in the time which he

* D. Campbell, a correspondent of Sir Arthur Rawdon, writes to him from the besiegers' camp before Limerick on August 22nd, 1690: "We have an account that my Lord Tyrconnel has sweetened the French, so that three of their regiments are returned for the defence of Limbrick." (*Rawdon Papers*, p. 335.) The report was an exaggeration.

allowed himself before returning to England, largely owing to Sarsfield's destructive raid upon his siege-train on its way to the walls.* O'Kelly unfairly declares that Tyrconnel and Lauzun were "crest-fallen" when they heard of this brilliant exploit, but the Duke of Berwick and La Houguette expressly state that they detached him on the mission. Again, when, Sarsfield having proclaimed his intention of going to the relief of the garrison, Tyrconnel announced that he would head the army in person, O'Kelly pretends that this was "to prevent any brave attempt that might be made contrary to his design"—the design, to wit, that Limerick should fall into the enemy's hands! The madness of partisanship could go no farther.

Tyrconnel re-entered Limerick a few days after William threw up the siege, and appointed Dorrington governor in place of Boisseleau, who was to return to France with the rest of his compatriots. He had himself decided to accompany the French, and therefore rapidly made arrangements for the conduct of affairs during his absence. He sent the army into winter quarters, ordered some fresh infantry regiments to be raised, and then handed over the military

* In the brave garrison who had defended the place was the Captain Richard Talbot who is described as the Duke's natural son, though his early history has never been traced. Stevens mentions that in the following May he was made colonel of "the regiment which had till then been the Grand Prior's"; but he gives no details about his new commanding officer except his relationship to Tyrconnel.

administration to the young Duke of Berwick, with a council of officers to advise him. Civil affairs were put in the charge of a senate of twelve.

Berwick's *Memoirs* state that Tyrconnel "thought it necessary for him to go into France to represent there the ill state of affairs and to make it understood that without very considerable reinforcements Ireland could not be held." There can be no doubt that this is a just account of Tyrconnel's object. O'Kelly says that the Viceroy "gave out himself, and his creatures spread it abroad, that he was sent for by James to give the King of France a true account of the present state of Ireland, Louis having declared that the several relations given him of affairs there were so various and clashing that he resolved to suspend his belief till Tyrconnel himself came in person to inform him." There is nothing inconsistent in this with Berwick's account. The hostile O'Kelly, however, ridiculing the idea of a general leaving his army in face of a victorious enemy to carry a report which might be given by letter or by a trusty friend, continues: "The despatch that came to him out of France, which he met at sea and sent to the new senate, making no mention of his being sent for or expected there, but to the contrary encouraging him to a vigorous defence and assuring him of a speedy relief from the French King, shows the fallacy of this reason. Others, who pretended to penetrate a little farther, were of opinion that Tyrconnel was on fickle terms in France, and

perhaps with James himself, for having advised him to that shameful retreat he made out of Ireland, in hopes it might induce the nation (who indeed were much discouraged at the King's flight) to a speedy compliance with the design."

The same writer accuses Tyrconnel of leaving the power during his absence in the hands of that section of the Irish Roman Catholics who coveted nothing more than to submit to the Prince of Orange—namely, the "men of New Interest," who, having purchased from the colonists confiscated estates, were dispossessed of them by the Act of Repeal and hoped to get them once more by submission to William. "These were the men advanced by Tyrconnel to all beneficial offices of the kingdom without regard to merit or capacity for their employments; for to be a creature of Tyrconnel's was the only qualification requisite in those days to make a complete captain or an able statesman." To this party belonged most of the twelve senators, according to O'Kelly; while the military advisers appointed to advise Berwick appear as "the English and Scotch directors left by Tyrconnel to guide the youth," Sarsfield's inclusion among them, we are told, being most grudgingly made.

Probably we need hardly remark that what O'Kelly writes about Tyrconnel at any time must be looked on with suspicion, owing to his violent animus against him. With regard to the present complaint against his constitution of the provisional government, it is

indeed probable that few of O'Kelly's friends were selected. But why should Tyrconnel put in control of affairs men who had plotted underhand to depose him and even to commit a hostile act against the French allies of the King? As for the charge that his "creatures" coveted nothing more than submission to William of Orange, it is on a piece with the charge against Tyrconnel himself. It is not among the Tyrconnelites that we find the traitors. Henry Luttrell and Baldearg O'Donnell, who sold themselves next year to the usurper for a pension of five hundred pounds a year apiece, were enemies, not friends of Tyrconnel—Luttrell, indeed, a member of the party which O'Kelly admires and supports.

CHAPTER XV

TYRCONNEL GOES TO FRANCE

TYRCONNEL did not take his wife with him when he started on his forlorn hope to the Court of France, for the reason that he had sent her away already. The date of her departure is obscure. Only O'Kelly records her going* when he says, at the time of the siege of Limerick, that Tyrconnel "shipped away his wife, an English lady, with all his own wealth and the King's treasure into France, where she gave out, pursuant to her instructions, that all Ireland was lost save the cities of Limerick and Galway, which could not hold out long, and that the nation for the most part submitted to William."

O'Kelly and Lord Melfort must have rejoiced, if they ever met, to compare notes over the iniquities of Lady Tyrconnel. Had Melfort written the above he would, no doubt, have suggested that Frances appropriated the "King's treasure" on the voyage. O'Kelly

* Dangeau on August 11th mentions that she is coming back to France. (*Journal*, III., 189.)

does indeed say that the money was used by Tyrconnel himself on his arrival in Paris. But what he does not explain is what treasure belonging to the King—Louis XIV. is here intended—was left in Connaught for anyone to misapply. We hear of it nowhere else, whereas we do hear of the desperate need of money among the Royalists. But it need occasion no surprise that we should see the man who was giving what remained of his life to the preservation of his country accused of embezzling money when his men were in rags and all but starving. Gratitude was not the harvest which Tyrconnel reaped when, on the Revolution, he espoused the cause of loyalty. Before he died he was destined to have a still bitterer proof of the readiness of man to forget faithful service.

Tyrconnel, Lauzun and the French troops sailed from Galway about the 12th of September, according to the *Jacobite Narrative*. Tyrconnel himself was in haste to be off, not only because of the critical state of what remained of his viceroyalty, but also because he knew of the intention of his enemies among the Irish to send a deputation to Saint-Germain to make representations against him and perhaps even to ask that he should not be sent back again.

The account of Tyrconnel's mission in *Macariæ Excidium* is, as might be expected, very unfriendly. O'Kelly represents that he went over to France intending to throw the blame on the Irish for all that had happened; but on landing he had advice that it was

no use to do so, now that the successful defence of Limerick had rehabilitated their name, and that he must instead censure Lauzun and the French troops. He therefore pretended to be ill and urged Lauzun to go on to Paris without waiting for him and tell to James and Louis the story which they had concocted between them. Lauzun hurried forward and related to the two kings that Ireland was lost and that the nation was generally inclined to the Prince of Orange, while he praised Tyrconnel and attributed the success at Limerick to him. Tyrconnel, arriving after him, informed the kings that affairs were indeed desperate, but that something might have been done if the French could have been persuaded to stay at Limerick or to act at all for the service of James or the interest of Louis. Lauzun was "thunderstruck at this unkind return of his dear comrade," but could not unsay what he had already said about Tyrconnel's bravery. He had no defence to make for himself; and so dissatisfied was his own master with him that only the intervention of James and Mary saved him from going again to the dungeon in which he had been once before.

Having disposed of Lauzun, Tyrconnel proceeded to bribe the French ministers—this is still O'Kelly's story—with the King's gold which he had sent before him into France; and he enlisted his wife's aid. "Some were of opinion that his lady's former acquaintance with Louvois, the great favourite and chief

minister of Louis XIV., was of no small advantage to him at this time," says O'Kelly, who continues: "To gain the favour of the English courtiers who were then about James, he confidently imparted to them his design, and the reasons he had for it. He owned himself an Englishman by extraction; that his lady was one by birth; and that whilst he continued in any power in Ireland he would maintain there the English interest, and neither suffer it to be lost nor separated from the Crown of England, as the Irish would have it. This ingenuous declaration of Tyrconnel gained him the friendship of most of the English at that Court, who were not wanting to render James sometimes jealous of Louis, as if he designed to conquer Ireland for himself, and that therefore he should follow the advice of Tyrconnel, who knew best how to disappoint the French king of his intention."

O'Kelly, it can be seen, is not one of those who accuse Tyrconnel of wishing to hand over Ireland to France.

Tyrconnel's own position being secure, he now approached Louis with his request for succours. But he purposely only asked him for a small quantity of arms and provisions, to be sent three or four months later. He made no demand for men or money; for was not his intention (in O'Kelly's opinion) to ruin Ireland? Having done what he wanted, he hastened his preparations to return.

With the tale told in *Macariæ Excidium* we may compare the statement of King James, as it appears in Clarke's *Life*. Tyrconnel so far got the start of his enemies in Ireland as to finish his business in France before their deputies arrived. "The King indeed had done it to his hand before he came, by convincing the Court of France how great a pity it were not to second the Irish valour, when it gave such hopes of maintaining that diversion which was so beneficial to them; so that my Lord Tyrconnel had nothing remain'd but to get the grant executed, wherein he showed himself a diligent and active courtier, tho' now an old and infirm man,* and gained so much credit with His Most Christian Majesty as to be heard by him in person (his minister being present) and to obtain in great measure what he asked as to clothes, linen, corn, arms, officers and some little money, upon condition he would return immediately himself, and then they promised these things should follow."

James, therefore, only sees "a diligent and active courtier" where O'Kelly professes to find a lying and bribing intriguer. Similarly the King gives a much

* Even O'Kelly, however, is constrained to admit that he was still "a man of good mien and stately presence." Perhaps to this period—if to any period at all, for it is probably an invention—is to be assigned a story of Louis XIV. and Tyrconnel. The French King, struck by the Irishman's resemblance to himself, pleasantly enquired whether his mother had ever been at "the Court of the King our father." "No, Sire," answered Tyrconnel, "but my father was."

A likeness can be seen between some portraits of Tyrconnel and of Louis XIV.

From a contemporary engraving.

LOUIS XIV.

less harsh version of Tyrconnel's conduct towards Lauzun, though we must admit that even he makes him treat his late colleague with a diplomacy that was more clever than kind or honest. He says that Tyrconnel persuaded Lauzun on their arrival at Brest that they both had many enemies and must stick to one another and justify each other's actions; that his own age and infirmity made fast travelling impossible for him; and that Lauzun must make what expedition he could to Paris alone. Lauzun agreed, went on in advance, justified Tyrconnel, and secured a very gracious reception for him. But when it came to Tyrconnel's turn to answer certain questions about Lauzun, "he said indeed he believed he meant well and did his best, but he could not excuse certain failures, which were too manifest to be palliated." When Lauzun heard this "he was in a mighty rage, but there was no retracting what he had said in my Lord Tyrconnel's justification, who little valued his resentment, having dextrously made use of him to establish his own credit with the Minister [Louvois], who was charmed to find the blame cast upon a person he affected so little."

Tyrconnel's behaviour in this affair reminds us of his behaviour towards Ormonde in earlier life and reveals the least pleasant trait in his character, a willingness to act the friend to a man for whom he had no real liking, if thereby he could make him serve his turn until he thought it time to throw him over.

Ormonde forgave him more than once, being no harsh judge of his fellows. Lauzun did not forgive and took the first opportunity which occurred to avenge himself.

Having accomplished his mission to his own satisfaction, Tyrconnel set out for Brest again, intending to sail at once for Ireland. With him he took two tokens of James's esteem for his services in Ireland, a Knighthood of the Garter* and the full title of Lord-Lieutenant, which he had never held before. "Now Tyrconnel is as great as the King can make him," remarks the *Jacobite Narrative*. He further received, at a farewell audience at Versailles on December 3rd, a gift from Louis of his own portrait in a magnificent diamond box. But at Brest some news arrived to disturb his contentment. It was to the effect that deputies from his enemies in Ireland had just landed at St. Malo.

Tyrconnel had scarcely quitted Galway in September when the revolt against his authority, which had smouldered on since the days of the retreat from the Boyne, broke out into open mutiny. A great meeting was held at Limerick of the Irish nobility, the Roman Catholic bishops, and "the prime officers of the army,"

* A letter from Robert Harley to Sir Edward Harley, December 2nd, 1690, says: "Tyrconnel has the Duke of Grafton's blue garter." (*Historical MSS. Commission, XIV., Appendix, Part* 2, *Portland MSS.*) Grafton died on October 9th, from a wound received at the siege of Cork, and Tyrconnel received the Garter on or before November 16th (new style), according to Dangeau.

as O'Kelly calls them; the adherents, that is to say, of Sarsfield, Henry Luttrell, and that party. This meeting denounced the provisional government set up by Tyrconnel as illegal and proposed that Berwick should be asked to assume general command of the King's affairs in Ireland, putting aside the advisers assigned to him by Tyrconnel. It was decided, too, that the already suggested mission to Versailles and Saint-Germain must be sent without delay. On September 30th the leaders came with their proposals to the young Duke. In his *Memoirs* the latter gives a moderate version of what occurred. "Sarsfield, Simon Luttrell, brother of the Brigadier, and Brigadier Dorrington," he says, "came to see me at Limerick on behalf of the General Assembly of the nation, to tell me that they had reason to suspect that Tyrconnel would not sufficiently represent their necessities at the Court of France and therefore they prayed me to take steps to do so myself. I replied that I was astonished that they should dare hold such assemblies without my permission, that I forbade them to do in future, and that on the morrow I would let them know my intentions."

On the following day Berwick called an assembly of nobility and gentry, ecclesiastics and officers, and told them he would agree to the sending of a mission to Paris, proposing the names of the Bishop of Cork; of Simon and Henry Luttrell; and of Colonel Nicholas Purcell, who was one of Sarsfield's warmest supporters.

The names were agreed to and the deputation started. With them Berwick sent, on his own account, Colonel Maxwell, who in O'Kelly's eyes is "a cunning Scotchman" and the instigator of Berwick's proceedings at this juncture. Maxwell was instructed to explain to King James how the mission came to be sent and to persuade him not to allow the return of Henry Luttrell or Purcell—"the two most dangerous mischief-makers, whom I had chosen expressly in order to get them away."

The agents had scarcely left when a letter arrived from James to his son, forbidding their departure and ordering that Tyrconnel's arrangements should be observed. It was too late, however, to recall them, and they proceeded on their way unchecked. Berwick says that on the voyage it was proposed to throw Maxwell overboard—the secret of his instructions must have been badly kept—but that the Bishop and the elder Luttrell prevented this crime; and so all arrived together at St. Malo.

James represents Tyrconnel as being very alarmed when he heard at Brest of the arrival of the deputies. "He writ to the King that he wondered the Duke of Berwick could be so far overseen as to suffer Henry Luttrell to go to St. Germains, unless it were with the same view he himself had formerly sent My Lord Mountjoy; and so, thinking to cross-bite them, persuaded the King to keep them there now he had them, not doubting but matters would go on more to his

satisfaction in their absence; for tho' Sarsfield's head (he said), now that it was turned to popularity, was quite out of its natural situation, yet he hoped when he came back to set it right again, if his counsellors Hen. Luttrell and Col. Purcell were kept from him; so begged of His Majesty to do it, assuring him he would use the softest and gentlest means imaginable to bring people to reason, but if that would not do was resolved to secure the proudest amongst them and send him into France."

James does not mention the intervention of Maxwell, who posted on ahead of his unfriendly colleagues from St. Malo and arrived first at the exiled Court. In consequence of what he said and what Tyrconnel had written, the Irish deputation was at first refused an audience and was in danger of imprisonment. But, "being cunning and insinuating people, and backed not only by men of distinction in the army, but at Court too, gained so much credit at last as to make the King balance with himself whether party he should endeavour to satisfy." They begged for a general to be sent to Ireland independent of the orders of Tyrconnel, who was no longer qualified for such a superintendence as he had hitherto exercised, his age and infirmities making him require more sleep than was consistent with so much business and his want of military experience rendering him exceedingly slow in his resolves and incapable of laying projects. They made various complaints against him and his party, "particularly

Mr. Antony and Richard* Hamilton," but also generally against " all that had any ty to his intrest."

James, though on his own admission he " balanced," was afraid that if he made any alterations in his arrangements in consequence of what he had heard, it would still further disgust Louvois and forfeit his always very grudging support of his cause. He tried, therefore, to " send back the army ambassadors in such a temper as would make them live easily with him [Tyrconnel]; which cost the King a great deal of trouble and pains and was lost labour in the end."

O'Kelly's version is that James, after he had abandoned his first hostile attitude towards the deputies, attempted to make them drop their intended prosecution of Tyrconnel; while " Queen Mary herself, whom people judged more sensible of her true interest than James, was heard to say she knew no reason, when the King and she were satisfied with Tyrconnel's conduct, why the Irish should dislike it."

When the Irish had their interview with Louis, continues O'Kelly, although out of respect for James they " forbore grating too much upon Tyrconnel's conduct," they obtained an assurance that whatever St. Ruth, the general whom he had recommended to James to take command of the army, should judge from personal inspection to be necessary for carrying on the work in Ireland should receive his own

* This must have been a mistake, as Richard Hamilton was still a prisoner in the enemy's hands.

immediate support. Practically this was a promise that St. Ruth's command should be independent of Tyrconnel, as the deputies asked, though it rested with James to confirm the arrangement.

Tyrconnel waited at Brest for some little time during the progress of the Irish agents' negotiations in Paris; for, though he had left Versailles on December 3rd, it is not until January 4th (new style) that Dangeau's *Journal* records the news of his embarkation. He probably was not yet acquainted with the wavering of his master, who now after so many years almost listened to the proposal to lay him aside. Otherwise he would scarcely have agreed, as Berwick says he did, that it would be best to allow Purcell and the younger Luttrell to return to Ireland after all. Tyrconnel had with him a patent for Sarsfield to be Earl of Lucan, Viscount Tully and Baron Rosberry in the Irish peerage. He was not in despair, as we have heard, of setting his head right again, provided that his bad advisers were removed from him.* But now these advisers were to be allowed to go back to their evil work; an incomprehensible piece of folly on the part of both James and Tyrconnel.

* Berwick, who, though he admires Sarsfield's bravery, has a poor opinion of his abilities—did the fact that after Sarsfield's death he married his widow affect Berwick's judgment, we may wonder?—says: "Henry Luttrell never ceased to turn his head for him and to exalt him everywhere, though not through real esteem for him but in order to make him popular and thereby use him for his own designs." For Henry Luttrell no one has a good word, but he must have been a plausible man to acquire an influence over Sarsfield, who was, after all, a sincere patriot and a loyal Jacobite, however hard it is to explain his participation in the Limerick plot and his conduct at the battle of Aughrim.

Within a year both Luttrell and Purcell were to prove how well they deserved the Bastille. The anxiety to humour Sarsfield, however, is to be understood. He occupied a position in the esteem of the Irish which Tyrconnel himself had once held, and without his co-operation the task of prolonging the war in Ireland may well have looked hopeless.

The importance of retaining Sarsfield's services is no doubt the best explanation of King James's attitude towards Tyrconnel in the affair of the Irish deputation. For one who has the character, whatever his faults, of faithfulness to his friends, James does not figure on the present occasion so well as he might have been expected to figure. He listened, in Tyrconnel's absence, to the complaints which malignant foes brought against him and actually was in doubt for a time whether he ought not to deprive him of his post. If he had not revealed this in his *Memoirs* we might have hesitated to believe it. But they are frank upon the point, as upon many others where a less honest man would have been reticent. They also show, however, how harassed the King was by the dissensions among his adherents, and therefore furnish the only excuse which can be made for what approaches perilously near the betrayal of a faithful servant. How little Tyrconnel deserved this and how futile was the endeavour of others besides him to keep the royalist flag flying, the immediate collapse of Ireland after his death is a sufficient testimony.

Tyrconnel goes to France

Whether Tyrconnel took his last farewell, as it proved, of his wife and daughters at Saint-Germain, or whether he was accompanied by any of them to Brest, is unknown. From the moment of her departure from Ireland in advance of Tyrconnel in 1690, we have no further mention of Frances, beyond the passage quoted above from *Macariæ Excidium* and some casual allusions occurring in Dangeau's *Journal*, until she makes her effort to obtain from the Williamite government a portion of her forfeited estates. Of the daughters we hear less still. As the Duchess of Tyrconnel carried with her into France all her husband's papers, and they, while mentioned as being in her custody still in 1693, have not been heard of since, though a search has been made for them in Paris, it is probable that they are totally lost and that we shall never hear how or when Richard Talbot and Frances Jennings last looked on one another. Their final meeting, like their first, is purely a matter of conjecture.

CHAPTER XVI

THE LAST STAND OF TYRCONNEL

"ABOUT the fourteenth of January," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "the Duke of Tyrconnel, accompanied by Sir Richard Nagle, Sir Stephen Rice and others, returned out of France into Ireland and landed at Galway, bringing with him a few thousand pounds in silver and gold. From thence he came to Limerick, where he was received with the usual respect that is due to a person in his high station."

O'Kelly asserts that "the braver Irish"—that is to say, his own mutinous friends—were displeased at the Duke's return. But the patent for Sarsfield as Earl of Lucan conciliated him at least, for the nonce, and might perhaps have induced him, as King James hoped, to live easily with his superior, had not the plan of keeping his evil mentors in Paris unwisely been abandoned.* Some results of the revolt of the previous

* O'Kelly, however, makes Sarsfield, on the receipt of a letter from France which had escaped the censorship established by Tyrconnel over the incoming and outgoing mails, have copies of it distributed among the army and gentry. This announced the appointment of St. Ruth to the supreme military command, independent of the Lord-Lieutenant. O'Kelly is always apt to

September were still evident; Berwick, in spite of his father's commands, having allowed himself to be unduly influenced by the anti-Tyrconnelites to take some high-handed measures. Tyrconnel had left as Secretary, during Nagle's journey with him into France, Lord Riverston, the former Thomas Nugent. Sarsfield, or more probably his mischievous adherents for him, professed to have discovered, early in November, traitorous relations between Riverston and other members of the Senate, on the one hand, and the Williamite commanders in Ireland, on the other. Riverston's removal was demanded, and Berwick consented. With him was disgraced his Scottish brother-in-law, Colonel Alexander Macdonnell, whom Tyrconnel had left as Mayor of Galway. Even O'Kelly admits that there was no motive for the removal of Macdonnell, a brave soldier, except that he was allied by marriage to Riverston. As for the latter, he "was really esteemed by many . . . was indeed nobly descended; but his greatest merit was the friendship of Tyrconnel, who made him Secretary of State and War, though perhaps unfit for the employment." This is very half-hearted condemnation, it must be allowed, from so keen a partisan as O'Kelly.

attribute to Sarsfield (whom James is said by d'Avaux to have summed up, not unjustly, as "a very brave man, but one with no head") the thoughts and acts of his unprincipled supporters, so that we need not necessarily credit him with this flagrant disloyalty to the King's representative. James himself says that Sarsfield was put "in a good temper enough" by his patent, "and, being really zealous in the King's service, engaged for the quiet comportment of the other mutineers, and acted heartily in conjunction with the Lord-Lieutenant while his former counsellors were absent."

Tyrconnel, on his return, promptly restored Riverston to the Senate, the Secretaryship being resumed by Nagle. He also set free from the citadel of Galway Judge Daly, whom Berwick had arrested as late as January 10th, on suspicion of correspondence with the enemy. In this case Tyrconnel made a mistake, for Daly was a traitor and is consequently admired by the writers who support the Prince of Orange. But reckless accusations of treachery had been rife during the winter—whispers being breathed even of Berwick's dealings with his uncle Churchill, now Earl of Marlborough—and it was doubtless difficult to discriminate. Daly is styled by O'Kelly "one of Tyrconnel's chief confidants," but what we hear of him previously shows that he belonged to a moderate section of the Roman Catholics, akin to those of England.

Less easy to deal with than the results of Berwick's weakness and inexperience was the state to which Tyrconnel found the army reduced during his visit to France. John Stevens is full of admiration for the Irish soldiers (though, as he says, he is no Irishman himself) during the winter of 1690-1 and after, and writes in his *Journal* a little later: "It is really wonderfull, and will perhaps to after ages seem incredible, that an army should be kept together above a year without any pay, or if any small part of it they receiv'd it was . . . equivalent to none. And what is yet more to be admir'd, the men never mutiny'd, nor were they guilty of any disorders more

than what do often happen in those armies that are best paid." Yet they were short of food and destitute of all comforts. Stevens, in fact, amply confirms the statement of King James, who doubtless derived his intelligence mainly from letters sent him by Tyrconnel personally:

"My Lord Lieutenant . . . found the soldiers so miserably naked that it moved compassion, nor were the officers any better; so he thought in the first place to clothe the latter, which he proportioned to do for five louis d'or apiece, and, that they might not think it too mean a cloth, resolved to wear a suit of the same himself; but, they having more mind of the money, he sent a man into France only to buy linen, and distributed the greatest part of the money he had brought amongst them. . . . This took thirteen thousand louis d'or, and he brought but fourteen thousand with him, besides ten thousand he left at Brest to buy meal, etc.; so there remained but a thousand louis d'or for all other necessary provisions, caissons, carts, carriages for the artillery, etc., nothing of which could be had or made to move without money. In this situation the number of men, instead of augmenting the strength, only served to multiply difficulties and increase the burden."

Tyrconnel did his best to remedy the hard situation alike of the army and of the country-folk upon whom they lived by sending out commissioners to regulate the quartering of the troops and the collection of

cattle and provisions. But he could not do much in face of the increasing want and misery until the promised French fleet should arrive. He therefore wrote "to press its departure with great earnestness and at the same time to represent its insufficiency" when it should come, "their necessities being greater than imagined, even to occasion mutinies in several places." The only effect of this was to provoke an indignant letter from Louvois, admonishing him that he must govern Ireland with sufficient prudence not to let the common cause suffer through personal animosities, and must turn to the best account the succours already received or about to be sent. He promised, however, that if Tyrconnel would send, as James had arranged, twelve hundred recruits for the Mountcashel Brigade in France, he would represent his further demands to Louis.

Very little military action had taken place in Ireland while Tyrconnel was away; but that little had tended to make the arrival of assistance from abroad much more difficult. William of Orange had left General Ginkel in command when he departed for England after his failure at Limerick, and had also despatched an expedition under Marlborough to attack Cork. In a brief campaign at the end of 1690 Marlborough, with assistance sent him by Ginkel, reduced both Cork and Kinsale, and so deprived the Royalists of all ports except those of the West coast. Tyrconnel himself had experience of the greater care now necessary in crossing

from Brest, as we learn from the mouth of his enemies. A letter from Lord Pembroke to Lord Nottingham, early in February, 1691, says of the attempt to cut off the returning Lord-Lieutenant: "We have always had ships in the soundings and with orders as the King [William] commanded, but they write to us word that Tyrconnel went from Brest fifty leagues into the sea before he turned for Limerick, by which means it was impossible for our squadron to have any sight of them."

It was during Marlborough's short stay in Ireland that mischief-makers hinted that Berwick was in correspondence with him. In view of the characters of the two men we may be sure that, if any suggestions were made, they were that the uncle should return to his allegiance,* not that the nephew should desert. James pays no attention to the story. In mentioning his recall of Berwick, orders for which he sent by Tyrconnel, he says that one reason for his moderation to the Luttrells and Purcell was that "he was in pain for the Duke of Berwick, with whose privacy and consent those commissioners came away, who did as good tell the King they looked upon him [Berwick] as a sort of hostage for their good reception and kind treatment." He resolved therefore to remove his son out of harm's way.

* Marlborough was indeed already engaged in negotiations with Saint-Germain, and in the following January wrote directly to King James, expressing sorrow for what was past and love for his person.

Berwick left on February 24th, and still the French succours had not arrived. O'Kelly says that St. Ruth's long delay "staggered the Irish" and pleased the Tyrconnelites. The latter accusation is of course entirely unjust. Tyrconnel was as staggered as any of those whom O'Kelly calls "the Irish." He was at his wits' end to know what to do while he waited. He had, on his return, called in the base coinage, now practically valueless, though telling those in possession of it, through the Commissioners of the Mint, that no one should be a loser when it should please God to restore the King. But he had nothing wherewith to replace it beyond the sum which we have seen mentioned by James, and nearly all this he had disposed of at once. With the passage of time matters grew quickly worse. James thus describes the state of affairs just before the arrival of St. Ruth:

"It was now the beginning of May and there was yet no news of the fleet, though for a month they had been reduced to eat horseflesh, nor had the soldiers seen a bit of bread nor any sort of drink but water for above that time. Besides, by the account which my Lord Tyrconnel had of what this fleet would bring when it came, he perceived it would fall infinitely short of supplying them with those necessaries that were in a manner indispensibly required. There was so little money and so small a quantity of provisions that all my Lord Tyrconnel aimed at was only to give the soldiers each a penny a day and their bread, with

rations to the officers in proportion ; yet upon computation he found it would not reach for two months, unless the King sent a thousand pistoles more, which he earnestly begged His Majesty to do, though he spared it out of his small allowance and retrenched it from the necessary expense of his family."

Again : "The Irish as yet heard nothing of the fleet from France, though they were at the last extremity and wrote to the King in case it came not in a few days they would need no enemy to destroy them. The Duke of Tyrconnel had, however, been making all the preparation he could in the interim, and had found means with great difficulty to get two pair of brogues, a pair of breeches, and a pair of stockings for each foot soldier, which, with the coats and shirts they expected from France, would cover them at least. He had distributed the little he had as long as it lasted with as much equality as possible ; having sent part of what was at Galway to Sligo by sea and to Athlone upon men's backs, for want of carriages."

While paying this what must be admitted to be a fine tribute to the old Tyrconnel's energy and resourcefulness, James does not disguise the trouble in which he was through the constant complaints made against the Lord-Lieutenant concerning his management of military affairs and "certain partialities which it was hard for a man in so much power and so many provocations to keep entirely free from." Lauzun, who was still a constant guest at Saint-Germain, "sided openly

with the complainers, but that my Lord Tyrconnel was not much astonished at. . . . But what gave him most disquiet, he said, was to find by His Majesty's coldness to him he had given too much credit to the insinuation of his enemies."

Tyrconnel, indeed, could scarcely affect to be surprised if Lauzun was now a bitter enemy. He had, on the other hand, the right to demand that the King should not suffer his favour towards himself to be diminished by the slanders which reached Paris from Ireland. But a greater mortification was about to befall him than mere coldness of the King.

On May 8th the French fleet from Brest at last appeared at Limerick. General St. Ruth was accompanied by two lieutenant-generals, de Tessé and d'Usson, by a few other Frenchmen, and by the Luttrells and Purcell. "At his landing on the quay he was saluted by a discharge of the artillery from the Castle," says the *Jacobite Narrative*. "In his proceeding he found the soldiery of the town ranged on each side of the street. The Viceroy came to meet him a hundred paces from his palace and gave him the *bien-venu* into Ireland and then brought him to dinner." A Te Deum was sung at Limerick as soon as the fleet arrived, according to James, for "it was like the gaining of a victory to people in so great distress." And no doubt after the weary wait since the beginning of the year there did seem reason for enthusiasm now that help had actually come.

Yet we are told by an observer on the other side, in picturesque phrase, that the late advent of St. Ruth "was lookt upon like the pouring of brandy down the throat of a dying man." It was indeed no better. Besides his officers, St. Ruth brought a good supply of provisions, ammunition, and clothing. But of money he brought none. Tyrconnel, who had in hand enough only to pay the soldiers a penny a day for three weeks more, at once "repeated his earnest petition to the King to send him a thousand pistoles more, which would continue that pay three months, by which time, he said, the matter would be decided; and that since the fate of a kingdom depended upon it, he took the freedom to tell him he ought to sell the shirt from his back rather than fail."*

That St. Ruth should have brought with him no money was a heavy blow to the Lord-Lieutenant. It was accompanied by a deep personal wound to his pride. The story of this, based on James's *Memoirs*, is as follows: James had so far listened to the representations of the Irish agents who came to him in the previous autumn that, though he refused to remove Tyrconnel, he consented to abridge his power in reference to military affairs, the direction of which was vested in a manner wholly in St. Ruth. "So that my Lord Tyrconnel, who before could have made a lieutenant-general, had not power now to make a

* Somewhere in his *Journal* Stevens remarks, with reference to James II., "Even kings in distress grow cheape, and their very friends usurp an unbecoming familiarity with them."

colonel, which so lowered his credit in the army that little regard was had to his authority. But he prudently submitted and left the whole management of it to St. Ruth, who seemingly carried fair, but in the bottom was prepossessed against him, which those gentlemen that came with him from France [the Irish agents] had leisure and opportunity to do, so that when St. Ruth wrote to the King for more money he desired it might not be remitted to my Lord Tyrconnel's hands."

This, then, was the reward of so much fidelity and self-sacrificing toil. It is not surprising to learn that the prudent submission of which James speaks was not so apparent to those on the spot. O'Kelly says that Tyrconnel and "his creatures" confidently averred that St. Ruth was sent to command the army under his authority, and suggests that James, who forbore to insert anything derogatory to his viceroy in St. Ruth's commission, only notified his intention to him by a letter which either never reached, or else was concealed by, Tyrconnel. Since we do not know the fact concerning this letter and James does not enlighten us, we can come to no conclusion as to the legality of Tyrconnel's attitude. The shock to the dignity of so intensely ambitious a man, however, is easy to comprehend, whether it was conveyed directly or indirectly.

The result of the policy to which James had been driven was to create a disastrous division of control.

The Irish Lord-Lieutenant and the French General entertained opposite views as to the right course to be pursued. The former was for Fabian tactics, the latter for vigorous action. Both had some justification for their choice. Tyrconnel knew what his army had done and what it could reasonably be expected to do; and he knew the state of the country only too well. St. Ruth had had experience of Irish troops when Mountcashel's Brigade fought well under him in Savoy the previous year; and, though he quickly appreciated the poverty of Ireland for the purpose of feeding an army on the march, he had come over to strike a blow on behalf of his own king. He does not appear to have been hampered by such instructions as had been given to Roze and Lauzun, to avoid decisive actions.

Nor was the lack of harmony confined to the two heads. D'Usson was more friendly to Tyrconnel than to his own superior officer. Lucan (Patrick Sarsfield), now once more influenced by his former counsellors against Tyrconnel, was nevertheless by no means well inclined to the French, especially St. Ruth. A more hopeless state of disunion could scarcely be imagined, well justifying King James's complaints in his *Memoirs* as to the ill way in which he was served, not only by his rebellious subjects and his allies, but also by his own people.

The last campaign of the war in Ireland opened in leisurely fashion about the beginning of June, but soon became brisk. Outside the province of Connaught

the Royalists held no post except a small fort at Ballymore, Westmeath, guarding the road to the important position of Athlone. Ginkel advanced against this and easily captured it on June 8th, so that nothing now barred his march against the key of the Shannon.

The Royalists on their part moved their headquarters from Limerick to Athlone, which had distinguished itself by its defence against the Williamite General Douglas the previous year and was so strong naturally that St. Ruth is said to have declared that " the Baron de Ginkel deserved to be hanged for attempting to take it, while he himself deserved to be hanged if he should lose it " (*Jacobite Narrative*). Its regular garrison was not large, consisting of fifteen hundred men under Colonel Nicholas Fitzgerald and the Frenchman d'Usson; but in camp a couple of miles away was the whole strength of the King's army, which at the beginning of June amounted to twenty-five thousand foot and five thousand five hundred horse. Tyrconnel came to the camp as well as St. Ruth, and at once the unhappy discord between them and between the Lord-Lieutenant and the Nationalists broke out actively. The account given in the *Jacobite Narrative* is very favourable to Tyrconnel, but there is no dispute as to the main facts, and we may therefore follow it, corroborating it with details from other sources.

In 1690 Athlone had been attacked on the Connaught side—the town lay on both banks of the river—and a strong entrenchment had been cast up on that side

by the defenders to ward off assaults. This entrenchment or "curtin," as James's *Memoirs* call it, was still standing and prevented free access from the camp to the town. "The Duke of Tyrconnel gave his advice for demolishing this work," says the *Jacobite Narrative*. "His reason was because the garrison might then be continually sustained from the King's army that was hard by, and so far as to be able to drive the enemy out of the town though he should have entered, which was undeniably true. . . . But Tyrconnel's opinion was rejected, I suppose upon a belief that the usual garrison was sufficiently able to hinder the enemy from entering the town. . . . Notwithstanding this, St. Ruth's confidence was afterwards frustrated, and the Viceroy's sentiment proved the best and would have proved the preservation of the place if it had been followed." (James states that d'Usson opposed the demolition of the curtain, saying that their business was to defend, not demolish, fortresses.) "I wish," the same author continues, "the dissenting from his opinion did not proceed from animosity to his person, which the faction of the year precedent at Limerick, or some one or more of the faction, conceived, and it seems there is much of probability in this consideration; for if the cabal had only a true zeal for their king and country in opposing the judgment of Tyrconnel, as believing their own ways more efficacious to those ends than his, they would not exhibit any disrespect unto him for declaring his opinion how to

compass the welfare of the nation. Because first, they had no ground to suspect his loyalty; secondly, because he bore the king's person in the government of the kingdom, to whom therefore they owed veneration; and, thirdly, because he was above them, not only for his quality, long experience, and his high station, but moreover for having been owned two years before by the loyal parliament as the pillar of his country. . . . That behaviour of theirs must needs spring from a cankered animosity; for such is the nature of this sort of spleen as not to regard civility, honour, gratitude, or any other decency."

This writer's quaint statement of the case cannot be considered immoderate if he was justified in suggesting that the rejection of Tyrconnel's views was inspired in any way by the personal dislike of some of the Irish for him. And, whatever St. Ruth's attitude in the affair, whether spontaneous or prompted by others, there is no denying that the subsequent attack on the Lord-Lieutenant, which he did not prevent or punish, was most disgraceful. "About the middle of June," says the *Narrative*, "a message was sent to the Duke and delivered by Lieutenant-Colonel O'Connor, viz., that if His Grace did not withdraw from the camp, he would cut the cords of his pavilion.*

* Story, in his *Life of William III.*, says that "one Lieutenant-Colonel Connell came to my lord's tent and bid him begone from the camp, else he would cut his tent cords. My Lord Tyrconnel, knowing that he durst not be so impudent without a considerable faction to support him, went next morning early towards Limerick." The outrageous lieutenant-colonel appears to be the same Connell of whom we have already heard in Stevens's *Journal*.

Here Tyrconnel made a noble conquest of himself, who might that day give the kingdom to the enemy, if he were resolved to vindicate off-hand the indignity cast on the King's authority and on his own person, for he was able to destroy the Irish army in an hour's time by raising an intestine war in the middle thereof, so great was his interest in that host. He had five regiments of the cavalry for him, he had three or four of the dragoons, and half of the best foot. The greater heads of the nation and the more sensible persons would have stuck to him against a faction that acted by no public authority; for the nation, if called to a voting, would not leave themselves to their management. . . . But the Duke of Tyrconnel, though a man of elevated spirit, thought it best to smother at present his resentment for the welfare of the King and country, because the time and place were not proper for his vindication without endangering the common cause; though it is believed if he had lived a year longer he would have brought the faction to a condign punishment for the affront offered the King in the person of his lieutenant."

Tyrconnel's toleration of the outrage against him was, we may suspect, dictated by his bodily sickness as well as by his desire to avoid a trial of strength with his enemies at such a juncture in his master's affairs. He had some time previously written to Queen Mary that his old distemper had not left him and that palpitation of the heart daily increased upon him.

In this condition even "fighting Dick Talbot" was compelled to be a man of peace. He returned to Limerick and received there the news of the fall of Athlone on June 30th and of St. Ruth's inability to attempt its recapture owing to the strength of the entrenchment whose destruction had been refused. He had the melancholy satisfaction of knowing that his advice had been right. But what was this to set against the entry of the enemy into Connaught? Moreover, wild accusations of treachery were made, the scapegoat fixed upon being Colonel Thomas Maxwell, apparently for no other reason than that he was a Scot, and, in the words of *Macariæ Excidium*, "one of Tyrconnel's creatures, without whose countenance it is unlikely he durst venture playing such a prank in Ireland."

Undeterred by the way in which his previous intervention had been received, or perhaps encouraged to think that now he might be listened to with more respect, Tyrconnel proposed a defensive and dilatory war in expectation of further succours from France next year, the result of his unceasing appeals to King James. He suggested that the infantry should all be withdrawn to Limerick, while the cavalry should be sent over the Shannon at Banagher to raid the province of Leinster and obtain recruits among the Roman Catholic inhabitants.

St. Ruth would not hear of this and determined to fight a pitched battle. He dropped back slowly before

Ginkel until he reached a spot where he considered that the ground would favour him. Fixing on Aughrim, he there awaited the enemy, having first sent to Galway d'Usson, on whom he laid the blame for the loss of Athlone and who disagreed with his policy now. On July 12th the fiercest and most equal battle of the whole war was fought, the effect of the training and the hard-gained experience of the Irish army being very apparent. Most Jacobite writers held that only the death of St. Ruth turned the day. "In the opinion of all people," says O'Kelly, "if he had lived but an hour longer, the Irish would be victorious that day; and in case he were worsted, had he outlived the defeat no man would despair but he would soon retrieve it. . . . [With him] died all the hope and good fortune of Ireland." Whatever he had done or not done since his landing, St. Ruth had succeeded in gaining the confidence of the majority of the extreme section of the Irish. Probably his dealings with their compatriots in Mountcashel's Brigade had shown him how to treat them; and of course his reputation as a harrier of Protestants in France did not lower him in their eyes.

St. Ruth, however, as has been said, had not gained the esteem of Lord Lucan; the loss of Athlone led to a widening of the breach; and the consequence was very untoward. Lucan had under his command at Aughrim the best of the Irish cavalry and was posted by St. Ruth in reserve until he should be ordered to

move. He obeyed orders strictly, and in fact went further, for when St. Ruth fell he did not even then act on his own initiative, the result being that he did nothing in the battle except to cover the retreat. He did not disgrace himself as did his friends Henry Luttrell and Purcell, who rode away precipitately with their regiments; but he certainly won no glory for himself on this day when his unmounted comrades won so much. The author of the *Jacobite Narrative*, who is a keen sympathizer with the hitherto much-reviled infantry, exclaims: "So let them keep their priding cavalry to stop bottles with!"

James says that the losses of his adherents amounted to four thousand, which is considerably higher than the estimate of the *Jacobite Narrative*—about two thousand killed and six hundred wounded. Among the latter was John Hamilton, the youngest of the six brothers, who had by now risen to the rank of Major-General. He was captured and succumbed to his wounds at Dublin shortly afterwards. Viscount Dillon died on the field, whereby Frances's son-in-law Henry succeeded to the title. In Colonel James Talbot Tyrconnel lost a kinsman of the Templeogue branch of his family; and various others connected with him by marriage also laid down their lives.

The *Jacobite Narrative* gives the following account of the Lord-Lieutenant's reception of the news of Aughrim, which reached him at Limerick on the morning of July 13th: "He was struck with a deep

wound of sorrow, and the more because the battle was lost so unexpectedly. However, he roused his courage and kept hope alive, resolving to continue the war since he found the excellent magnanimity of the army and that the loss of that day was not very considerable. Upon which, in the first place, he despatches away into France three expresses, one after the other, the Earl of Abercorn [Claud Hamilton, the fifth Earl, cousin of the many brothers who figure in the present work], the Lord Thomas Howard of Norfolk, and Mr. Doran, his own secretary, that if one or two should fail in the journey, the third might safe arrive at St. Germain's to give the King a true account of the combat at Aughrim. Secondly, he requests by those couriers a reinforcement of trained men out of France at the farthest by the next spring, and in the interim provisions and ammunition for the army; for he did not doubt to preserve Limerick. . . . Thirdly, he goes out of Limerick on the fourth morning after the battle to receive the cavalry six miles off the town, which he cantoned near Limerick . . . while he was expecting the foot to come in, and then he will enter upon a consultation what is best to be done in this straitness of time."

Owing to the little which we know of the movements of Nicholas Plunket, the supposed author of the *Jacobite Narrative*, it is impossible to judge how far he represents accurately at times the attitude of the man of whom he is so stalwart a defender. But

he is certainly more correct here than O'Kelly, who pretends that after Aughrim Tyrconnel "immediately despatched an emissary to King James, representing that all was lost and that it was impossible to retrieve Ireland by any other means at present than by an early submission to William." James records that Tyrconnel wrote to him to "beg either a speedy succour or leave to make conditions for themselves." There was no faint-heartedness in such a request as this. Before the disaster of Aughrim Tyrconnel had continually urged the necessity of fresh assistance if the struggle was to be continued. The loss of St. Ruth, a great number of royalist officers, and many of the pick of the rank and file made the case desperate should support be delayed. Louis, who had received from his own representatives in Ireland assurances that more arms and supplies were essential, saw that the request made to him was, in James's words, "too reasonable not to be complied with," and prepared to send both money and other help.

The question remained for Tyrconnel whether he could hold out until he got what he hoped for. Ginkel acted with speed after the victory of Aughrim. On July 18th he invested Galway, where the new Lord Dillon was governor, with Lieutenant-General d'Usson to assist him, and a garrison under him of from two thousand to two thousand three hundred ill-armed and ill-clothed men. It was vainly hoped that aid would be brought by Hugh (Baldearg) O'Donnell, who had

been in Ireland since about the date of the Boyne and had collected from his native Ulster some thousands of rapparees, over whom he assumed a command practically independent of the royalist generals. But O'Donnell, as one of the line of the old Earls of Tyrconnel, hated the man to whom his family's title had been transferred,* and acted first with insubordination and then with actual treachery, selling himself to the enemy about the time of the attack on Galway, which, unrelieved, surrendered on July 24th, the garrison being allowed to retire with its arms and six guns to Limerick.

The usual recriminations followed, Tyrconnel being accused of "easily approving" the action of Dillon—whom O'Kelly calls his nephew, though he was in reality his wife's son-in-law—and d'Usson; while some blamed Lord Clanricarde and other nobles in the town for "considering nothing but their own security." As a matter of fact, it was the weakness of the town's defences, for strengthening which no money had been available, that lost Galway, not treason; for even if O'Donnell had come to the rescue his rapparees could have done nothing against Ginkel.

Treason was, however, in the air, and some of Tyrconnel's last days were spent in combating it. The *Jacobite Narrative* paints what is unhappily too

* O'Kelly makes the Duke of Tyrconnel aim at fomenting discord between O'Donnell and Gordon O'Neil, son of the rebel Sir Phelim and head of the old lords of Tyrone, hereditary rivals in Ulster to those of Tyrconnel.

favourable a picture of the rally to the old viceroy, when it says that those officers of the army who had been violent factioneers against him "do now own their fault and acknowledge that His Grace was all along in the right, though 'twas a submission made too late." On the contrary, the villainous Henry Luttrell opened communications with the enemy immediately after the fall of Galway and discussed what terms could be granted in case of submission, "which," according to James's *Memoirs*, "by the partisans he had in the army raised a mighty inclination to make terms and submit." Fortunately "my Lord Lucan, whose intentions were always right, and he zealous for the King's service, was the first that opposed his old friends when he found they went beyond the limits of their duty and allegiance to the King, and it was by his means that Luttrell's secret correspondence was discovered." A letter for Luttrell sent from the enemy's quarters came accidentally to Lucan, who suspected and opened it. "He went immediately with it to my Lord-Lieutenant, upon which Luttrell was seized and appointed to be tried, which was done as speedily as possible, but he had too many friends to be condemned, so was sentenced only to continue in prison during His Majesty's pleasure." When Limerick surrendered, Henry Luttrell was set at liberty and received the common reward of treachery from William of Orange, a pension.

Lucan had behaved well in this affair, but the

consequence to him was that "his credit, now that he sided with my Lord Tyrconnel, began to be as low as his"; and the disloyal ones continued the efforts of Luttrell, showing how little their opposition to the Lord-Lieutenant had been due to the superior patriotism which they claimed. Tyrconnel, however, persevered gallantly in spite of all obstacles. He collected the remaining army—now reduced to about nine thousand men, including the unarmed and some fresh recruits drafted in since Aughrim—in a fortified camp under the guns of Limerick, and sent out foraging parties to collect cattle and provisions. He decided also to bind his troops by a more solemn engagement than they had hitherto taken on them. "He made the officers and soldiers (first setting the example himself) to take an oath of fidelity, which contained a resolution to defend His Majesty's right to the last and never to surrender without his consent." Notwithstanding the oath, the movement for submission still went on. "But he pressed them only to have patience for twenty days, there being no likelihood of their being forced so soon, and that in so much time an answer might be had from the King."

This is the account based on James's *Memoirs;* though the *Jacobite Narrative* states that Tyrconnel actually received an answer to his message sent after Aughrim, and that it was to the effect that a reinforcement of men could not be spared, but that a fleet with provisions and all necessaries of war would soon be

at Limerick. Dangeau mentions the arrival in Paris on August 29th (new style) of a letter from Tyrconnel, dated twelve days earlier, in which he "thinks to sustain things in Ireland if some succours are sent him." To this, of course, no reply can have been received.

The hope which Tyrconnel had of seeing help arrive, whether it was based on a letter from the King or on the faith he had in him, was not destined to be fulfilled. The fleet indeed sailed from Brest and reached Limerick in October. But on August 10th d'Usson gave a dinner-party to the Lord-Lieutenant. "He and the company were very merry," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "but at night, upon his preparing to go to bed, he found himself indisposed.* The next day his malady increased. Remedies were applied yet to no effect. On the third day, observing his weakness to be great, he settled his worldly affairs and took care for his conscience. . . . On the following day His Excellency grew speechless, and on Friday the fourteenth, being the fifth day of his sickness, he expired."

On the 14th Sir Richard Nagle, who owed so much to Tyrconnel, wrote two letters from Limerick to Viscount Merrion. In the first he said:

"The enemy are within four miles of the Town. . . . I have hopes things will go well, notwithstanding

* "He was seized with a fit of an apoplexy . . . soon after he had done his devotions." (Clarke's *Life of James II.*, II. 462.)

the unfortunate Destemper of my Lord Lieut., who lies gasping, and do believe he will dy within four and twenty hours. God of his infinite mercy preserve us!"

"I am sorry to tell you" [runs the second] "that my Lord Lieut. dyed this day, about Two of the Clock. It was a fatall stroke to this poor Country in this Nick of Time. . . . He is to be buryed privately to-morrow, about Ten of the Clock at Night. As he appeared always zealous for his Country, so his loss at this time was extream pernicious to the welfare of this poor Nation."

Curious rumours were circulated after Tyrconnel's death. "Some said of poison," remarks the *Jacobite Narrative*, "and there was ground for it." O'Kelly, however, is more or less justified when he attributes the origin of the tale to "the English." It is at least among the supporters of the Prince of Orange that we find it most circumstantial. Story, for instance, though he himself favours the theory of a fever, mentions that "some say" a cup of ratafia was the cause of death. And a newsletter, written in French, sent from London to Holland on August 28th (old style), and now among the manuscripts of the Earl of Denbigh, mentions the arrival on the previous day of an express from Dublin announcing Tyrconnel's death, and continues: "It is said in that country that some wretch (*quelque diable*) on his own side poisoned him in Limerick because he was in favour of

capitulating, and that for the same reason they shot Mr. Luttrell, a distinguished officer."

Luttrell, as we know, was not shot, much as he deserved the fate by any military code; and it is probable that the report of Tyrconnel's poisoning was equally untrue. The combined effects of his unceasing toil and anxiety, his excessive bulk and weak heart—and, no doubt, also the over-merry party at d'Usson's—were sufficient to account for the sudden collapse of a man of sixty-one, without recourse to the horrible idea that someone of his own party brought him to an unnatural end.

On the night of Sunday, August 16th, by order of the three Lords Justices* whom he had appointed on his death-bed to carry on the government, the body of the Duke of Tyrconnel was buried in the cathedral church of Limerick—"not with that pomp his merits exacted," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "but with that decency which the present state of affairs admitted."

No stone marks the unknown grave of Tyrconnel in Limerick Cathedral, though it might be thought that he should be allowed to share with many lesser dead the forgiveness which death and time bring for faithful adherence to a beaten cause. Perhaps, had he been a Celt, his resting-place had not been suffered

* Baron Gosworth (better known by his former name of Alexander Fitton), Sir Richard Nagle, and Francis Plowden, an Englishman who had not long arrived from Saint-Germain and who afterwards became one of the "governors" to the little Prince of Wales.

From an engraving by W. N. Gardiner, after the picture in the collection of Lord Beaulieu.

RICHARD TALBOT, DUKE OF TYRCONNEL.

to be forgotten. But the feeling against him which embittered his last years appears to have had strength to extend beyond his lifetime and to deprive him of the honour of any material record of his burial-place in the land wherein he was born and for which he fought and died. He is at least in good company, for neither has Dundee a tomb to mark the spot where he lies at Blair.

Dundee was hailed on his glorious fall as "the last of the Scots." Yet his death was not, by more than half a century, the end of Jacobitism in Scotland; whereas Tyrconnel's preceded by less than a couple of months the end of Jacobitism in Ireland.

Tyrconnel championed three causes: a land, a faith and a king.* Whether he was right or wrong in his advocacy of any of the three is a matter of opinion, and it affects not the question of his unfaltering loyalty. To Lord Macaulay, it is true, he is "one of the most mercenary and crafty of mankind," "a cold-hearted, farsighted, scheming sycophant." This is how the sycophant wrote in one of his last letters to his Queen:

"Since I have nothing more to ask of any kind of honour or riches if the King be re-established—God knows I have more of both than I deserve or care to have—Madam, this I say from my heart, what should

* "Thus," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, "this great man fell, who in his fall pulled down a mighty edifice, videlicet, a considerable Catholic nation, for there was no other subject left able to support the national cause." As an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, Plunket naturally makes his country and religion the chief objects of Tyrconnel's devotion.

I have or care for more if God has so decreed it that I shall not live to see it ? As long as my powers endure and are agreeable to him I will to the last moment of my life serve him the best I am able, for my integrity and loyalty shall end with my life—to him, to Your Majestie, and to the Prince your son."

If the accent of sincerity cannot be detected here, where shall we recognise it in any letter ever sent by a subject to a sovereign ? And the sovereign in this case was a poor exiled queen, living on the bounty of a foreign land.

PART V

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER I

THE WIDOWED DUCHESS

FRANCES DUCHESS OF TYRCONNEL was about forty-two years old when her second husband died at Limerick. She had still before her another forty years of life. The history of this long period is full of gaps and for the most part obscure. Nothing more can be attempted here than a sketch, with some of the details filled in here and there where it is possible to make them out. Roughly, the remaining forty years—1691-1731—fall into two divisions at the date 1708, in the former of which we have a fair amount of information, while in the latter we are almost entirely without it until the end.

When the intelligence of Tyrconnel's death reached Paris, his Duchess was still residing where he left her at the end of 1690, with the exiled Court at Saint-Germain. There is no account of the reception of the news by the widow or by the Court in general. Dangeau merely states that it was known at Fontainebleau on September 16th (new style) that

Tyrconnel was dead.* Of Frances herself only two mentions have been traced in the year 1691; the first when she stood godmother at the parish church, on March 19th, to the infant son of Robert Strickland, Vice-Chamberlain to Queen Mary; the second when on May 26th she accompanied James and Mary to a stag-hunt at Marly and rode with Mary, Madame de Maintenon, and the Countess of Gramont in Louis's *calèche*. After this there is a silence until the February of the following year.

On the 23rd of that month a letter written by Robert Harley, in London, states that Lady Tyrconnel has come over from France. The object of her visit is made plain by some documents among the State Papers of William and Mary in the Record Office. Here we learn that "Frances, Countess-Dowager of Tyrconnel," as she is called, has petitioned for the possession of "the manors of Cabragh and Taragh and other manors and lands in Ireland," which were settled upon her at her marriage in 1681 with Richard Talbot, afterwards Earl of Tyrconnel. On the latter's attaintment for high treason in 1689 these manors and lands had, with all his, been "seized into Their Majesties' hands as forfeited," and were still kept from the petitioner, though she claimed that after her husband's death she had become entitled to her

* The funeral oration by Messire Anselm at the Church of the English Sisters in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine was not preached until August 22nd in the following year. No doubt Frances had returned to Paris long before this ceremony took place.

jointure-lands, and therefore prayed Her Majesty that she might be let into the possession of them.

This petition was referred in August to the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland (Henry Sidney, Earl of Romney). Frances was too wise a woman to wait for the result of the tedious process of the law. Besides, her position in England as the widow of one who was looked on as an outlawed and attainted rebel was dangerous, and she required special permission from the existing government to stay in the country. She returned to Saint-Germain. In her absence those who were in occupation of her estate took vigorous action to defeat her petition. Romney had asked his Solicitor-General, Sir Richard Levinge, to report on the case. On April 25th, 1693, without the privity of the Solicitor-General, Frances was indicted of high treason at Kilmainham quarter-sessions, the object being to procure her outlawry. Levinge in his report mentioned this charge against her, adding that "it is not much to be doubted that her activity in those times [1688-90] exceeded most others of her sex." He also called attention to the fact that she "went into France and remains with Their Majesties' enemies without licence."

Mary, however, interested herself in the case while her husband was away on the Continent, and we find a warrant issued to Romney on July 12th to stop proceedings against Lady Tyrconnel and allow her to traverse the inquisition mentioned in the Solicitor-

General's report. The duty of executing the warrant fell to the Lords Justices who replaced Romney in Ireland after he had disgusted the dominant faction there by his lenity to the Roman Catholic population. The spirit in which their lordships executed their task may be seen by the letter which they sent to Mary on October 7th, informing her that orders had been given to stop proceedings. "We fear," they wrote, "that any further acts of grace to this lady will be of ill consequence. By the Solicitor-General's report we find that in her activity in the late rebellion she exceeded most others of her sex, and acted against Your Majesty, not with the duty of a wife to her husband, but with the malice of an open enemy, provoking him upon all occasions against the Protestants of this kingdom; and when she could do no more mischief here, she fled into an enemy's country and continues there to this day, so that, of whatever validity the deed of settlement may be which she pretends to, she has forfeited her interest by her own treason as well as by her husband's. After what she has done, it would tend to the great discouragement of the Protestant subjects here if further acts of grace be shown her (as they impute a great part of their sufferings to her instigation), and would tend to the strengthening of the Popish interest."

The Lords Justices wrote on the same day to Lord Nottingham in a similar strain, and it was he who replied to them. The Queen, he said, had done no

more than justice demanded. She had stopped the proceedings against Lady Tyrconnel, "which looks like a favour to her, and which you think she does not deserve; but Lady Tyrconnel petitioned for leave to come out of France to take care of this affair of her jointure, which was not thought fit to be granted, and the Queen therefore thought it hard to outlaw her and yet deny her liberty to appeal." Their lordships' representations, however, should be laid before the King when he returned to England.

Now Levinge intervened with a suggestion to the Lords Justices that, as Lady Tyrconnel had in her custody in France all the deeds, writings, and evidences relating to her husband, and these were of importance for maintaining Their Majesties' title to his estate, it would be greatly for their service that, if she were to have the benefit of their royal favour, she should cause these documents to be brought to England; and that if she did not produce them before the end of the next Hilary term, the process of outlawry should go on against her.

William, on his return from abroad, ordered the indictment to proceed. The final result was long delayed. In a letter to the Duchess of Modena, on October 9th, 1697, the Abbé Rizzini speaks of representations made by the Austrian envoy to the English plenipotentiaries at Ryswick that the rigours of Parliament against the Roman Catholics might be moderated, and adds: "But it is feared his good offices

will avail nothing through the cunning of Ruvigny, a French Huguenot, the bitterest enemy of the Catholics and one of the chief heads of the government there. . . . Ruvigny has already procured the confiscation of the estates of all the Irish who sided with the King or died in his service; so great numbers of rich and noble families are reduced to beggary, and the Duchess of Tyrconnel, who is with the Queen, loses something like 100,000 *scudi* a year and the finest palace in that country."

Still the widow refused to despair; and at last, in 1703, after the death of William of Orange and the accession of Anne, she succeeded in establishing her claim to the estate of Cabragh.

While the fate of her property in Ireland was being decided, Lady Tyrconnel continued at her duties as Lady of the Bedchamber to Queen Mary in Paris. From an undated "Liste of such as lodge at the Castle" among the *Nairne Papers* in the Bodleian Library it appears that she had rooms on the first floor at Saint-Germain, as also had her fellow Ladies of the Bedchamber, the Countess of Almond and Lady Sophia Bulkeley. Of these two, with whom she was closely associated for many years, the former was the Queen's lifelong friend, Vittoria Montecucoli, whom Mary had brought with her from Modena and had taken with her to France when she fled in 1688. Married to the Marquis Virgilio Davia, her faithfulness to her mistress was recognized by James when he created

her husband Earl of Almond in the peerage of Scotland. Lady Sophia Bulkeley was sister to the famous beauty Frances Stewart, and was herself the mother of four beautiful daughters, one of whom became, in 1700, the second wife of the Duke of Berwick, while another married Charles O'Brien, Lord Clare. For their services the ladies received a salary of four hundred pistoles apiece. On this sum—the payment of which, owing to the indigence of the Royal household, may have been irregular—on a small pension from Louis XIV., and on whatever she had left out of the wreck of her fortune, Lady Tyrconnel was compelled to live until, in September, 1699, King James assigned her a pension of three thousand crowns, perhaps in recognition of the supposed loss of her jointure-lands.

The course of daily life at Saint-Germain has been well described in recent books, *Queen Mary of Modena*, by Mr. Martin Haile, and *The English Court in Exile*, by Mr. and Mrs. Grew, and we shall not here try to picture it again. It must suffice to say that Anthony Hamilton's account, in his *Zeneyde*—which, though Hamilton admits that he was suffering from spleen when he wrote it, is implicitly accepted by Lord Macaulay—is not to be received as true. James and Mary grew more and more religious as they aged, but Saint-Germain was not the priest-ridden, monastic, melancholy, querulous place which Hamilton makes it out to be. The home of exiled sovereigns, struggling with an inability to make their small resources meet

the wants of their faithful followers, cannot well be the centre of gaiety. But amusements were far from being banned at James's French Court, and even Hamilton is compelled to admit that there were many charming ladies there, if their conduct did not afford his pen the harvest of scandal which Whitehall had yielded it in the *Memoirs of Gramont*. The relations between Saint-Germain and Versailles were pleasant, and Lady Tyrconnel, as one of the English Queen's ladies, frequently visited the Court of France. Dangeau records a number of these visits to Fontainebleau and Marly between 1694 and 1699, the Duchess on all occasions being treated with high honour and sometimes riding in the same carriage with Louis XIV., her own Queen, and members of the French Royal Family.

A few other references are to be found to Lady Tyrconnel at this period as godmother to infant children of Jacobites baptized at the parish church, notably on April 19th, 1700, when King James and she were the godparents to the son of Thomas Wivell, gentleman usher to His Majesty. She does not appear in any capacity at a wedding in December, 1702, at which we should have expected to find her present—that of "Milord Richard Talbot, Comte de Tirconel," and "Dame Charlotte Talbot," her step-daughter; but for her absence there was a good reason. She had obtained permission to go to England and thence to Ireland in connection with the affair of her jointure.

In March William had died, only surviving by six months the man whose place he had usurped, and now Anne was on the throne.

A curious glimpse is afforded us of Lady Tyrconnel on her journey through England on this occasion. On September 21st, 1702, Sir Charles Lyttelton writes to Viscount Hatton: "I had a letter last post from Sir J. Tal[mache] at Bath, of the 12th. . . . He says he went to Bath [from Laycock] in the stage coach, wherein were three women, two of which were set down at an inne at Cosham, which was but two miles from Laycock. One of em was, as much as she could, disguised, as would not let him alight to help her out of the coach. He suspected something extraordinary, and by her books of devotion, which she left in the coach and sent her footman for with other things, which he looked in and perceived her religion and confirmed him in his guesse, it was my Lady Tirconnell in her way to Ireland; and he says Lady Marlborough went that same day to see her and returned that night."

The two sisters had not met for at least ten years (we may suppose that they saw one another when Frances was in England in 1692), and in the interval their mother had died, leaving all she possessed to the younger. But Sarah and Frances were on friendly terms, and no doubt the powerful "Mrs. Freeman" was easily induced to use her influence with "Mrs. Morley" to aid in procuring a favourable issue to the long-protracted case of the Tyrconnel jointure-lands.

At any rate, Frances went on to Ireland, and in the following year, as we have already heard, succeeded in getting back part of her estate.

Did the sisters at their interview in September, 1702, discuss anything but private affairs? From the time of the elder's return to the Continent her relations with her brother-in-law became close; although hitherto they had been little better than strangers as far as we know. And it is a strange coincidence that Marlborough's dealings with the Court of Saint-Germain now increased greatly. In 1703 there were actually suggestions, the original author of which is uncertain, that the rightful King, whom even many members of the established government of England admitted to be at least Prince of Wales, should marry one of the Duke's daughters; and at Saint-Germain it was hoped that Marlborough's aid would defeat the efforts which were being made to bring Scotland into line with England in the matter of the "Protestant Succession."

Some time after leaving Ireland Lady Tyrconnel went to live at Delft, though whether she did so at once or not is uncertain. At any rate, we know that she had had a house there later, and as early as the end of 1704 she may have settled down in that neighbourhood. When Marlborough was leaving the Hague on December 11th, on his way home to England, he had an interview with her. In a letter from an unknown correspondent to Lord Caryll, secretary to Queen Mary, dated January 4th, 1705, the following

passage occurs: "You will perhaps wonder when I tell you that your friend Armsworth [Marlborough] invited himself to sup in private with Mrs. Trimings [Lady Tyrconnel] the very night he came away. This is the more to be wondered at because they had not seen one another in God knows how many years before. The gentlewoman herself tells me that their conversation, especially on his part, was all in general terms; and that, when she descended to some particulars, his answer was that he would do what honour and justice obliged him to do, without particularizing any thing."

If Lady Tyrconnel had already taken her house at Delft the supper may well have taken place there, Delft being so near to the Hague. There is but one reason known to us why she should have resided in Holland, and that is that she might act there as secret representative of the exiled Court, particularly in the negotiations with her great brother-in-law. She still held her position in Queen Mary's household for some years more, and therefore was in no way in disfavour through her journey into Ireland and her recourse to proceedings in the enemy's lawcourts. We may reasonably suppose that she had already in 1704 taken upon her the rôle of Jacobite agent which she was later known to the English government to be filling.

In 1705 she was troubled with ill-health, and decided to go for a cure to the baths of Aix, for which purpose it was necessary to procure a pass to take her through

the French lines, coming as she did from the territory of the allies. A letter from Marlborough to her survives, dated September 5th, and showing that he had procured the French pass for her and prepared a military escort for her first to Maestricht and thence to Aix. The letter concludes: "I heartily wish you a good journey and all the success you can desire with the waters. If I should not be able to have the satisfaction of seeing you at the waters, I hope to have that of meeting you in Holland before I embark; being with much truth, Madam, Your Grace's most obedient humble servant, M."

There is little in this letter to suggest that Marlborough and Lady Tyrconnel had ever talked politics to one another. But the Duke was too astute an intriguer to betray himself by documents which might fall into wrong hands. A series of communications to Robert Harley from a spy in the English service in Holland show the expectation which the Jacobites and their sympathizers had that the Duchess of Tyrconnel would be able to influence her brother-in-law. This spy was a Captain John Ogilvie, whose wife had some position at Saint-Germain. He went by the name of Lebrun and spent his time ingratiating himself with adherents of the exiled Royal Family and sending over to London the information which he acquired. In a letter of October 23rd, 1705, he informs Harley that he has, on a visit to Hamburg, made the acquaintance of a certain Count Belke, a

Swede in the French service, and is now on the best of terms with him. Belke says that Louis XIV. designs to propose a peace with the Queen [Anne], "that she shall reign peaceable all her life, but shall take such measures as that the Prince of Wales shall succeed to her." If this scheme fails, an expedition into Scotland or the north of England is to receive support from France. "You must know," adds Ogilvie, "that the Court of Saint-Germain know nothing of all this, neither will they have them to know anything of the matter until it is just ready to be done." Belke also tells him that he is to "see somebody to speak to the Duchess of Tyrconnel to see if she would persuade the Duke of Marlborough to be a good instrument in the Treaty of Paris."

The intrigue did not move at a very rapid pace, for on March 6th, 1708, we find Ogilvie writing again to Harley a letter in which he mentions the same Jacobite hope of capturing Marlborough through Lady Tyrconnel. This communication is sufficiently interesting to merit quotation in part. The spy states that another Ogilvie, a protégé of Lord Seafield, had been sent with a fellow Scot to try to pump him. "These two 'coy ducks' came with all the protestations of friendship imaginable, and at last were desirous to have my opinion of the invasion that was threatened from Dunkirk.* I told them briskly that I was

* The abortive expedition of 1708, when James reached the Firth of Forth but was forced by the French admiral who brought him to return to Dunkirk.

astonished that they, who did belong to my Lord Seafield, should ask me, for they might have better intelligence near him. 'For,' said I, 'My Lord, who is so well with the Duke and Duchess of Marlborough, needs but desire His Grace or Her Grace to demand of her sister the Duchess of Tyrconnel, who is Lady of the Bed Chamber to the Queen of St. Germain and consequently knows every step that is taken at that Court; and,' I said, 'I wonder my Lord Duke does know nothing, since he sees my Lady Duchess of Tyrconnel always when he passes and repasses to the Hague, for she lives at present at Delft, and not ask those questions of me, for it is above three years since I left France and that interest, and had been ever since in places very remote from that, seeking for my bread.' When I had said that, they looked as if they had been struck with a thunderbolt and in a minute took leave of me.

"I do not know," continues Ogilvie, "if you remember a letter I wrote to you above two years ago, wherein I told you that Count Belke did propose to a certain person to go and desire the Duchess of Tyrconnel to speak to the Duke of Marlborough to persuade him to be an instrument to oblige the Queen to make a peace, and to get her brother the Prince of Wales to succeed her; but the person it was proposed to would not undertake it."

Soon after Ogilvie wrote the above letter the Duchess of Tyrconnel abandoned her political work

on the Continent and at the same time severed her connection with Saint-Germain. The motive for the latter step is unexplained. She had not succeeded in gaining over Marlborough, although he continued to coquet with the exiled Court almost down to the death of Anne, while at the same time gradually securing for himself a sure footing with the Elector of Hanover, for whom he was as ready to "shed the last drop of his blood" as he had been for James II. But her failure to secure the services of this prince of traitors was by no means certain in 1708, and it is a mystery why she ceased in this year to interest herself in a cause for which she had fought so hard according to her abilities. The only explanation of her departure from Brussels, where she was temporarily residing, is furnished by a letter from Marlborough to his wife in May; and it does not suggest that she intended to pay more than a brief visit to Ireland.

"When I took leave of Lady Tyrconnel," says Marlborough, "she told me that her jointure was in such disorder that there was an absolute necessity for her going thither for two or three months for the better settling of it. As the climate of Ireland will not permit her being there in the winter, she should begin her journey about ten days hence. She said she did not intend to go to London, but hoped she might have the pleasure of seeing you at St. Alban's. I offered her all that might be in my power to make her journey to Holland and England easy, as also if

she cared to stay at St. Alban's, either at her going or return, you would offer it her with a good heart. You will find her face a good deal changed, but in the discourse I had with her she seems to be very reasonable and kind."

Lady Tyrconnel apparently fulfilled her intention of going to St. Albans and avoiding London. The story which Horace Walpole tells of the "White Widow" near the New Exchange is not accepted as genuine.* That she paid a visit to her sister, however, is shown by a letter which Sarah wrote to Robert Harley on August 27th:

"I have told my sister why the pass must be in her name, which she likes as well as any other, since you will do her the favour to order it so as to give her no uneasiness to travel in her private way. I forgot to speak to you for some letters out of Ireland to her, taken in Mr. Arthur's papers; she says they are only concerning her own affairs, and if they are from one of

* Thomas Pennant, in *Some Account of London*, speaking of the New Exchange which formerly stood on the south side of the Strand—having been built in 1608, "somewhat on the model of the Royal Exchange, with cellars beneath, a walk above, and rows of shops over that, filled chiefly with milleners, sempstresses, and the like"—says: "Above stairs sat, in the character of a millener, the reduced dutchess of Tyrconnel, wife to Richard Talbot. . . . A female, suspected to have been his dutchess, after his death, supported herself for a few days (till she was known and otherwise provided for) by the little trade of this place: having delicacy enough to wish not to be detected, she sat in a white mask and a white dress, and was known by the name of the White Widow." As authority for this Pennant quotes "Mr. Walpole." It may be noted that the story is not referred to the year 1708 and that therefore it might belong to 1692—in which case it might be true, for the Duchess was in London in 1692.

my nieces, I know that one must be a mother to give so much time as is necessary to read it, but I don't say this to prevent anybody's trying. That you will order, and when that is done, if you please to send them to Mr. Guydott, he will give them to my sister." . . .

After a stay with her sister at their birthplace the Duchess of Tyrconnel went on to Dublin; and from this point her history practically ceases until her death twenty-three years later. She took a house in Paradise Row, Arbour Hill, near Phœnix Park, and there passed the remainder of her days. The books of devotion by which Sir J. Talmache was helped to identify her on the coach journey to Cosham in 1702 seem to indicate the trend of her mind in old age. In Dublin she laid out part of the money of which she was accused of being so fond on the foundation of a nunnery in King Street, for the order of the Poor Clares; and as this was close to her home she no doubt interested herself constantly in the work of the nuns.

In the June of 1724 she received the news of the death at St. Omer of her eldest daughter by Sir George Hamilton, Lady Rosse. Two years later she made her will, and from the mention in this of her forgiveness of her daughters, Lady Kingsland and Lady Dillon, "for all the wrongs which they had done her," it is evident that there had been a quarrel, although there is nothing to show what it was about. It seems not to have been made up, for we gather that she was

alone at the time of her decease. This took place on March 6th (old style), 1731. During the night she fell out of her bed and, being too feeble to rise or call, she was found on the floor in the morning so perished with cold that she died in a few hours. Horace Walpole, who gives these details of her death, but wrongly attributes it to the year 1736, adds: "She was of very low stature and extremely thin; and had not the least trace in her features of having ever been a beauty."

A melancholy end for "Little Jennings," the beautiful maid-of-honour, who sixty years before had made such a sensation in the beauty-loving Court of Whitehall.*

The Duchess was buried in a vault in St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, while on one of the chapel walls of the Scots College in Paris, of which she had been a patroness, an inscribed tablet was set up to commemorate her and the fact that she had left money for a daily mass for the souls of herself and her two husbands. The college was destroyed in 1860, and with it the only memorial of three people so diverse in character and yet so closely interconnected by fate.

* As a token of how far her achievements at the age of fifteen or sixteen had been forgotten, we may note the statement in the issue of the *Gentleman's Magazine* for May, 1731, under the heading of Deaths in March: "The Dutchess of Tyrconnel, Sister to the Dutchess of Marlborough, at Dublin, *said to be* 104 *years old*."

CHAPTER II

THE DESCENDANTS OF RICHARD AND FRANCES

IT only remains, in the following short chapter, to recapitulate and add a few details to what has been said in the foregoing pages concerning those children of Richard Talbot and of Frances Jennings who survived to transmit their blood for one generation or more.

By Katherine Boynton Talbot had the daughter who, as Lady Charlotte Talbot, was attainted by the government in England in 1691. She accompanied her stepmother to Saint-Germain, and there, on December 19th, 1702, married her kinsman, Richard, third Earl of Tyrconnel, son of the William Talbot (of Haggardstown) to whom her father's earldom had descended. To these two a son, Richard Francis, was born in 1710, who, on his father's death in Scotland during the expedition of 1715, became the fourth Earl. Seven years later he lost his mother, who, after

serving Queen Mary as Lady of Honour, died at Saint-Germain on February 14th, 1722, in her forty-sixth year, leaving a daughter as well as a son. Richard Francis died on March 1st, 1752, being described in his obituary in the *London Magazine* as "Richard Francis Talbot, Earl of Tyrconnel, peer of Ireland, Major-General of the French King's armies, knight of the order of St. Lewis, and minister plenipotentiary of His Most Christian Majesty at the Prussian Court." Although he was evidently a man of considerable ability, singularly little is known of him, and it does not even appear whether he ever married and had issue. No one seems to have claimed his title, from which we may perhaps assume that he had no son. But as Mr. Lart states that among the Jacobite names still to be found in the neighbourhood of Saint-Germain is that of Talbot, it is possible that if there was such a son he may be even now represented by descendants there.

Of the daughter of Charlotte Talbot (who was also the third Earl's, since Charlotte did not marry again) we hear nothing beyond the mere fact of her existence.

The marriages of Frances Jennings's three daughters by Sir George Hamilton have been recorded. Elizabeth, Viscountess Rosse, bore her husband two sons. The elder, Richard, created an Earl in 1718, in his turn left a son, also Richard, who died without issue; the younger, George, died early. She had also three daughters, the eldest (Frances) marrying John Viscount Netterville, the second (Catherine), James Hussey of

Westown, and the third dying unmarried. In her will the Duchess of Tyrconnel mentions her granddaughters Frances and Catherine, as well as a great-granddaughter, Lady Betty Parsons, who must be a child of Richard, the first Earl of Rosse.

Frances, Viscountess Dillon, had a son Richard, the ninth Viscount. He, though married, had no son, and his title went to a cousin Charles, son of General the Hon. Arthur Dillon, who was created an Earl by James III. in 1721.

Mary, Viscountess Kingsland, had two sons, Henry-Benedict and George; the former being the fourth Viscount and leaving his title to his brother's son, called after his father George, with whom the line ended.

The fate of the joint daughter of the Duke and Duchess of Tyrconnel is, to say the least, rather mysterious. She is stated to have been named Charlotte (like her half-sister) and to have grown up to marry the Prince of Ventimiglia, a Provençal noble, by whom she had two daughters, one of whom married the Sicilian Prince Belmonte, the other a M. Verac, both dying without issue. But there is a singular lack of confirmation of these statements, up to the present date, from contemporary documents. We do not hear of this child, as we might expect, in the company of her alleged father and mother; and until fresh evidence can be procured there is reasonable ground for suspecting some confusion arising from the great

size of the Talbot family at the end of the seventeenth century. It is improbable, on the face of it, that Richard Talbot should have had two daughters named Charlotte. That he had one so named, by Katherine Boynton, who grew up to womanhood and was married in 1702, is proved from the registers of Saint-Germain-en-Laye. For the existence of the other we should naturally look for proof in the first place in the Duchess of Tyrconnel's will. Frances there orders her house in Dublin, with its furniture, to be let so as to pay off a debt due from Tyrconnel to Lady Dover and the heirs of Sir Charles Lyttelton, to which she supposes they have no title, no one having administered and his [*i.e.*, Tyrconnel's] daughter having lost all. We can hardly imagine that Frances is speaking in this way of a daughter of her own as well as the Duke's. The puzzle concerning Charlotte, wife of the Prince of Ventimiglia, awaits solution by genealogists.

Besides his legitimate children the Duke of Tyrconnel had the natural son Richard, with whom we have met in the Irish war of 1690-1. This young man, after a gallant career in Ireland, went to France to command one of the regiments in Mountcashel's Brigade. He continued to win distinction under the French colours in Italy, and rose in 1694 to the rank of Brigadier. Unhappily for himself he inherited his father's bluffness, not to say truculence, of speech, and in 1696 was so indiscreet as to censure openly the conduct of Louis XIV. in holding back an expedition

into England to restore King James. To make matters worse, he is said to have addressed his remarks to James himself. The offence could not be overlooked. Talbot was called to Paris, deprived of his command, and ordered to the Bastille, where he remained a prisoner for about a year, which was longer than his father had spent during his two terms in the Tower. After his release he was not restored to his rank, but some years later, volunteering for service in his old regiment, was slain at the battle of Luzzara, in 1702, atoning for his fault by a brave soldier's death. Had he lived until the '15 he would doubtless have been found, like his namesake and legitimate kinsman the third Earl, upholding the cause of the Prince who to the Talbots was King James III., and for whose son, to them Charles III., some of them at least fought thirty years later.

THE END

NOTES

NOTES

Page 3, line 6. G. S. Steinman points out that the marriage must have taken place at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, the registers of which were destroyed in the Fire of London; there is no record of it in the still surviving registers of the other two churches. (*Althorp Memoirs*, biography of Mrs. Jennings).

P. 6, l. 12. *Cal. State Papers, Domestic*, 1650. Dec. 31st. "Order—upon the petition complaining that Richard Jennings shelters himself in Whitehall from arrest for debt—that he and his family depart out of Whitehall within three days; and Col. Berkstead to take care that this order be put in execution."

P. 6, l. 22. If Frances was born in 1649, and was fifteen when she became maid of honour to the Duchess of York, the descriptions in the letters of the French ambassadors to Louis XIV. seem more appropriate than if she were two years older. (See pp. 191 *ff.*). Fifteen, too, appears to have been a common age for the maids of honour to begin their duties.

P. 8, l. 8. Mrs. Arthur Colvile states in *Duchess Sarah*, I do not know on what authority, that Richard Jennings was captured when fighting against the Roundheads. Miss Strickland's suggested identification with Richard of the Major Jennings mentioned in Salmon's *Examination of Burnet's History*, p. 533, will not bear investigation.

P. 9, l. 14. Carte, *History of the Duke of Ormond*, IV., 67. The other references to Carte in this chapter are all in the following pages or else on pp. 169-171 of his fourth volume.

P. 21, l. 24. *Continuation of the Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon* (1827), III., 117.

P. 26, l. 11. O'Kelly, *Macariæ Excidium*.

P. 28, l. 20. In his *Original Letters found among the Duke of Ormond's Papers*, II., 412, Carte publishes a letter to Lord Byron, in which Ormonde says of Cromwell at Drogheda: "Having made a breach which he judged

assaultable, he assaulted it, and being twice beaten off, the third time he carried it; all his officers and soldiers promising quarter to such as would lay down their arms, and performing it, as long as any place held out, which encouraged others to yield. But when they had once all in their power, and feared no hurt that could be done them, then the word *no quarter* went round, and the soldiers were many of them forced against their will to kill their prisoners. Sir Edm. Verney, Colonel Warren, Colonel Wall, and Colonel Byrne, were all killed in cold blood, as was also the Governor, and indeed all the officers, except some few of least consideration, that escaped by miracle. The cruelty exercised there for five days after the town was taken, would make as many several pictures of inhumanity as are to be found in the book of Martyrs, or in the relation of Amboyna."

P. 28, l. 25. Clarke, *Life of King James II.*, I., 326. James must have been told this by Talbot himself.

P. 35, l. 12. *Calendar of Clarendon State Papers*, II. Letter of W. Sparke, an English prisoner in Madrid, to William Edgeman, March 17th, 1653.

P. 41, l. 7. *Continuation*, III., 119-20. Clarendon, writing as so often from memory, says: "He was brought into Flanders by Daniel O'Neile, as one who was willing to assassinate Cromwell; and he made a journey into England with that resolution not long before his death, and after it returned to Flanders ready to do all he should be required." This is the basis of Macaulay's statement that Talbot was "introduced to Charles and James, when they were exiles in Flanders, as a man fit and ready for the infamous service of assassinating the Protector." James, it should be noted, did not quit the French service until September, 1656, and was present, therefore, at no introduction of Talbot to his brother.

P. 41, l. 24. *Thurloe State Papers*, III., 160.

P. 42, l. 3. *Nicholas Papers*, III., 264, 270.

P. 42, l. 21. *Thurloe St. P.*, II., 248. This "King's proscription against Cromwell" is found nowhere else, the reason for which is clear.

P. 44, l. 20. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 69.

P. 45, l. 29. *Ib.*, III., art. 50.

P. 46, l. 4. *Ib.*, III., art. 115.

P. 46, l. 8. James's letter, dated Paris, May 14th, 1655, is to be seen in a kind of appendix to the *Thurloe State Papers*, Vol. I., 666, being among a collection of documents communicated to the editor by the then Archbishop of Canterbury, from his library at Lambeth. James writes as follows, the italicized words being in cipher:

"There is a proposition has been made to me, which is to long to put in a letter; so that I will, as short as I can, lett you know the heads of them. *There are fower Roman Catholiks, that have bound themselves in a sollemn oath to kill Cromwell, and then* to raise all the *Catholiks in the citty* and the *army*, which they pretend to be a number so considerable as may

give a rise for your recovery, they being all warn'd to be ready for something that is to be done, without knowing what it is. They demand ten thousand livers in hand; and when the business is ended, some recompence for themselves ackording to their severall qualitys, and the same *liberty for Catholikes in England as the Protestants have in France.* I thought not fit to reject this proposition, but to acquaint you with it, becaus the first parte of the desine seems to me to be better layd and resolved on then any I have knowen of that kind; and for the defects of the second, it may be supply'd by some desins you may have to join to it. If you aprove of it, one of the fower, intrusted by the rest, will repaire to you, his charges being borne, and give you a full account of the whole matter. In the mean tyme, he desirs in his owne name and theirs, that you would lett but one or two, whome you most trust, know it, and enjoyne them secresy. . . ."

[This letter, it must be admitted, proves that James did not hesitate to mention an assassination scheme to his brother; but it cannot be made to prove anything against Charles in the matter.]

P. 47, l. 13. *Cal. St. P., Domestic*, 1655, Manning to Thurloe, July 10th/20th.

P. 47, l. 21, and P. 48, l. 9. *Ib.*, Manning to Thurloe, July 3rd/13th: "Captain Talbot, a tall young man and an Irish, and Rob. Dungan, who was Ormond's page, . . . are to England, by way of Dover, their business to assist Stephens." Same to same, July 10th/20th: "If I had a cypher with the Governor of Dover, Talbot, Dungan, and Holsal, whom I have called Holsey, should not have escaped him."

P. 48, l. 17. As late as November 2nd (new style), 1655, we find Manning writing to Thurloe: "Take a care of releasing the Irish Talbot." This does not necessarily show that Talbot had not been set free with Stephens. But Talbot in his letter of February 1st to Ormonde, quoted on p. 68 above, speaks of his own imprisonment in England for six months ("which is a thing publikely knowne to the King's best friends thear.") There was very little exaggeration in this statement, if Talbot was in prison most of the time between his arrival in London in July and his escape from Whitehall about the beginning of December. On the other hand, if he was free during September, October, and half November, he was telling Ormonde an untruth and referring him to the very people who could refute it with ease.

P. 52, l. 3. *Nicholas Papers*, III., 262. Letter of January 22nd/February 1st, 1656.

P. 52, l. 26. *Ib.*, III., 149-187.

P. 52, l. 29. *Ib.*, III., 202.

P. 53, l. 11. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 211.

P. 54, l. 13. *Nicholas Papers*, III., 158-9.

P. 55, l. 1. *Ib.*, III., 177-8.

P. 55, l. 9. The story of Richard Talbot's examination and escape, as given by himself and his brother Peter, is to be found in the *Clarendon Papers*, Vol. 51, ff. 6, 8, 10, 12, 17. Cp. *Calendar* of those papers, III., arts. 224, 227. Miss Eva Scott, in her *Travels of the King*, chap. V., furnishes a very full story, from the original sources, of the plot and its failure.

P. 58, l. 6. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 222.

P. 59, l. 16. *Ib.*, III., art. 226.

P. 60, l. 13. *Ib.*, III., art. 235.

P. 60, l. 19. *Nicholas Papers*, III., 243.

P. 60, l. 25. Of Hyde's letter of January 7th, the following passages are worth quotation: "The Jesuite . . . writ in his letter to Mr Harding, the story of his brother's escape, contrary to what we had heard before; and that he was taken the next day after Halsey; whereas you remember the letter from Will [Masten], that says they were taken together. I have likewise a letter from the Colonel to you, inclosed in Mr Lane's letter; which I think it is no matter for sending. . . . He seems to fear that his making his escape may lose his brother's credit, and make that matter miscarry: whereas I have some reason to be very confident that he and his brother had spoke with each other on this side the sea, before he came hither; and I am more confirmed than I was when we parted, that they are all in the pack of knavery. I had forgot to tell you that the last night, Mr Raney came to me in some trouble, and asked me whether one Gilbert Talbot had been lately here, and told me almost as much as I knew, which he had then seen in letters from Bruxelles; so that you may say what rare fellows those are, and why anybody should be bound to keep their secrets." (Carte, *Original Letters*, II., 63-4: *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., Appendix, art. 5.)

As Hyde writes from Cologne, he seems to imply that Richard Talbot had paid a visit there, though we find no other mention of it.

P. 61, l. 1. Carte, *Original Letters*, II., 68.

P. 61, l. 24, and p. 62, l. 1. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., arts. 193, 212. Letters of December 1st and 14th (O. S.), 1655.

P. 62, footnote. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. II. (Old Series).

P. 62, l. 16. *Clarendon Papers*, 50 *f.* 226; *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 201.

P. 63, l. 7. *Ib.*, III., art. 229.

P. 64, l. 11. *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, II., 159, from the *Carte Papers*.

P. 64, l. 19. *Ib.*, II., 160.

P. 65, l. 10. *Carte Papers*, 131 *f.* 162.

P. 65, l. 26. *Ib.*, 131 *f.* 160.

P. 66, l. 1. *Spic. Oss.*, II., 167, from the *Carte Papers*. Letter of February 26th, 1656.

P. 66, l. 27. *Ib.*, II., 160. Letter of February 3rd.

P. 68, l. 15. *Ib.*, II., 161-2; Carte, *Original Letters*, II., 69-71.

P. 70, l. 9. *Spic. Oss.*, II., 163-4.

Notes

P. 72, l. 20. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 222. Letter of January 3rd, 1656.

P. 72. footnote. *Ib.*, III., arts. 233, 236.

P. 76, l. 4. *Ib.*, III., art. 364. *Cp.* art. 321.

P. 76, ll. 18 *ff.* *Ib.*, III., arts. 416, 433, 445.

P. 76, footnote. He appears as Colonel "Muskry" in a military order of Charles II. in *H.M.C.*, *XIV.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 7, p. 17.

P. 78, ll. 1 *ff.* *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 321. Letter of April 28th and enclosure. Of James Talbot Ormonde wrote to Queen Henrietta Maria on May 23rd, 1649: "Your latest commands were those I received concerning Sir Robert Talbot and Father James Talbot; who, tho' of a name and blood, have hitherto very much differed in their ways; Sir Robert as zealously promoting his Majesty's service as the other hath been industrious to hinder it. Yet since your Majesty's goodness hath at once designed reward and forgiveness, it shall be my care, as far as lyes in my power, to observe that method." (Carte, *Original Letters.*)

P. 78, ll. 15, 18. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., arts. 425, 459.

P. 78, l. 25. *Ib.*, III., art. 469.

P. 79, l. 6. *Ib.*, III., art. 503.

P. 80, l. 26. *Mercurius Politicus*, April 21st, 1657.

P. 82, footnote. The first letter is published in Carte's *Original Letters*, II., 231-6.

P. 84, l. 1. *Continuation*, III., 120.

P. 84, l. 9. *Ormond*, IV., 67, *ff.*

P. 86, l. 13. *Ib.*, IV., 69.

P. 86, l. 27. *H.M.C.*, *V.*, *App.*, p. 147.

P. 89, l. 3. Hyde did his best to prevent the friar being forgiven. On November 8th, 1659, he writes to Ormonde from Brussels: "I hear there will be endeavour to get the King to send Tom Talbot to his charge in the Army, who hath done all he can to engage the Officers of the Army in a seditious address concerning the affairs of Ireland; in which he hath been disappointed by your nephew Muskery, Will Bourke, and most of the rest. Therefore I pray let no importunity prevail with the King to consent to a thing so dishonourable to him and scandalous in itself." And on the 22nd of the same month he writes: "I am sure his [Peter's] brother Tom does all the villanous foolish things here he can, and would set on foot all the extravagant demands which were made by the Irish, when they were almost in a full possession of the kingdom, to be obtruded now on the King by the two Crowns [of France and Spain]: and when he is told that it becomes him not, while he is in the King's displeasure, to meddle in any business, and that if there were no other reason men would not concur with them, he bids them not trouble themselves with that; does not his brother Peter manage all the King's affairs?" But on the 29th he says: "Tom Talbot hath now given over all his projects here and intends to meet you at Paris and to

be restored to full favour. I hope the King will not see him or give him any countenance." (Carte, *Original Letters*, II., 259, 278, 287.)

P. 88, l. 19. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. I. (New Series).

P. 89, l. 9. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 893.

P. 89, l. 26. Peter Walsh, *Remonstrance*, 529.

P. 90, l. 3. Hyde to de Marcés, July 23rd (August 2nd), 1659, in *Cal. St. P.*, *Domestic*, 1659-60. "Talbot, late a Jesuit," says Hyde, "has gone towards the treaty, where he will do as much hurt as he can." In the same volume is another letter, which certainly gives a suspicious appearance to Peter Talbot's conduct. It is written by Colonel Bampfield on August 18th/28th, 1659, addressed to "M. d'Arquibol" at Peter Wilson's, San Sebastian, and tells the recipient that his long silence has given both wonder and dissatisfaction to his friends here [? in Brussels], who will be assured of his sincerity when they find the success correspondent to his undertakings. Now M. d'Arquibol is an *alias* of Peter Talbot, and Bampfield was a notorious double-dealer, of whose communications to Thurloe some are preserved. The present letter to Talbot is perhaps too ambiguous to incriminate him in an understanding with the government in London; and, even if it did, the Jesuit might have pleaded, like his brother Gilbert before, that his object was to deceive the enemy.

P. 90, l. 7. Charles Lyttelton writes from Breda, May 6th, 1660, to Viscount Hatton: "I heare to-day father Talbot is expected every hower with the Spanish mony soe long upon the way, which will be very welcome, I assure you, notwithstanding all our greate newes from England; for, with all that, wee are as poore as ever, though I confess it be a wonder to me how it comes to bee." (*Hatton Correspondence*, I., 20.)

P. 91, l. 1. *H.M.C.*, *Bath MSS.*, Vol. II. Letter from T. Ross, September 14th, 1659, to Col. Holles.

P. 91, l. 9. See the letter to Ormonde from Richard Grace, colonel of his regiment, on the "unspeakable sufferings and miseryes" of himself and his men at Brussels in October, 1659. (*Spic. Oss.*, II., 179, from the *Carte Papers.*)

P. 91, l. 13. The extraordinary statement of King (*State of the Protestants*, 270) must be noticed, that "King James (if the Earl of Tyrconnel may be believed) chang'd his Religion on *his* Solicitations, for he often bragg'd that he was the King's Converter."

P. 92, l. 7. James had been appointed by his brother "Admiral of the Sea of Britain," as late as the summer of 1653. But then there was no fleet for him to command. It was in 1648, just after his escape from England, that he had been declared Admiral by the remnant of the royalist navy lying at Helvoetsluys.

P. 93, footnote. *Spic. Oss.*, II., 185, from the *Carte Papers.*

P. 94, l. 6. *Continuation*, I., 353, 357-8. The remaining references to the *Continuation* in this chapter are all to be found in the following pages.

Notes

P. 105, l. 1. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art 45.

P. 112, l. 2. With regard to Cominges's attack on Gramont, Lady Baillie-Hamilton points out that Clarendon says the ambassador himself was addicted to opium, and that Charles II. in a letter to his sister Henrietta on January 18th, 1664, writes: "This ambassadore is good for nothing but to give malicious and wrong intelligence."

P. 113, ll. 12, 15. *History of My Own Time*, chapters V. and IX.

P. 114, l. 12. See *My Lady Castlemaine*, pp. 16-18.

P. 116, l. 13. *Diary*, April 6th, 1668.

P. 116, l. 19. See G.E.C., *Complete Peerage*, and Sir James Balfour Paul, *The Scots Peerage*, on the Carnegies, Earls of Southesk.

P. 118, l. 20. *Ormond*, IV., 32.

P. 124, l. 15. *Ib.*, IV., 71.

P. 125, l. 12. Carte quotes (*ib.*, IV., 66) a letter from Ormonde to his friend Sir Maurice Eustace, written on September 3rd, 1661, when the Privy Council was in the midst of its debates on the Bill of Settlement. "I fear," says Ormonde, "the liberty allowed the Irish to speak for themselves will turn to their prejudice, by the unskilful use they make of it, in justifying themselves, instructing the King and his council in what is good for them, and recriminating of others. Whereas a modest extenuation of their crimes, an humble submission to and imploring His Majesty's grace, and a declaration of their hearty desire to live quietly and brotherly with their fellow-subjects for the future, would better have befitted the disadvantage they are under, and have prevailed more than all their eloquence. But it is long since I have given over any hope that they would do, or be advised to do, what was best for them."

P. 128, l. 15. The Talbots seem to have had some connection with Portugal. Peter had gone thither at the age of fifteen to join the Jesuits; and he was afterwards almoner to Catherine of Braganza. When in early 1660 Francisco de Mello, Portuguese Ambassador in London, wanted a messenger to send to Charles II. at Breda, he employed Sir Robert Talbot (Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 103).

P. 129, l. 14. *H.M.C.*, *IV.*, *App.*, *De la Warr MSS.* The first letter is unsigned, but is obviously written by Richard Talbot.

P. 130, l. 14. *Continuation*, III., 120.

P. 131, l. 9. *Ormond*, IV., 368.

P. 132, l. 6. *Ib.*, IV., 194.

P. 133, l. 27. The affair of the Clanmalier estate will be found in *Cal. St. P., Ireland*, 1660-62 and 1663-5. See especially Talbot's letters of November 7th and December 13th, 1662. The latter speaks of the interview with Ormonde.

P. 134, l. 21. *Ormond*, IV., 190.

P. 136, l. 3. *Spic. Oss.*, II., 190-1, from the *Carte Papers.*

P. 138, l. 19. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. III. (New Series), p. 101. Armorer's letter is in *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, August 27th, 1668.

P. 146, l. 27. *Ib.*, I. (New Series). Letter of February 11th/21st, 1652.

P. 147, l. 19. *Ib.* Letter of August 30th/September 9th, 1651.

P. 148, l. 9. *Ib.* Letter of August 11th/21st, 1654. Lady Baillie-Hamilton, who was so kind as to read in proof this chapter on the Hamiltons and to make a number of valuable suggestions, interprets differently Sir George's remark about his son here. She takes the "good face and some quality of blood" to apply to James himself, in which case the meaning intended to be conveyed by Sir George is that his son, being very much of a fine gentleman, might consider the obviously lucrative employment proposed for him by Ormonde to be beneath him. "This view," she writes, "is made the more probable from the fact that, at the little English Court at the Louvre, James and his younger brother George had early made the acquaintance of Gramont and other men of rank in Paris, with whom any profession other than the Army or the Church was held to be quite beyond the pale of Society—a consideration which would naturally carry weight with a man of good birth."

P. 149, l. 5. *Cal. Clar. St. P.*, III., art. 1149.

P. 150, l. 18. *Ib.*, III., art. 94.

P. 152, l. 5. The Marquis de Saint-Maurice, Ambassador for Savoy, writing from Paris on December 20th, 1669, tells a story of the Gramonts at a gaming-party of the Queen of France. The former Elizabeth Hamilton, who was acting as croupier, took the stool of the Comtesse de Soissons during her absence from the room. The Comtesse on her return asked for "her place." Elizabeth, without moving, said they would see about that. The Comtesse retorted with a sneering laugh, whereon Gramont intervened on his wife's behalf and said she should stay where she was. "Our family is quite as good as yours," he added. The Queen was afraid to say anything, but Louis, as soon as he heard of it, ordered the Gramonts to apologize to the Comtesse and in the end they were obliged to do so. Saint-Maurice comments: "The Countess of Gramont is English and puts on airs because she is related to the King, but they laugh at it here, which drives her to conduct which is by no means gracious. The other day when the Queen was going out in her carriage the Countess got in with her. The Queen asked her to go to the second carriage, but she had the hardihood to refuse, saying that it was not fitting for her to travel in the suite. The good Queen put up with this without another word." (*Lettres sur la Cour de Louis XIV.*, 1667-1670, p. 375.)

P. 158, l. 5. Mr. Allan Fea, in his edition of the *Memoirs of Gramont* (p. 135*n*), conclusively establishes the distinction between the two Misses Price, Henrietta Maria, maid of honour to the Queen, and Goditha, maid of honour to the Duchess of York.

Notes

P. 159, l. 6. Chamberlayne's *Angliæ Notitia* shows that in 1669 the Duchess's maids of honour were :—Arabella Churchill, Dorothy Howard, Anne Ogle, and Mary Blague.

P. 159, l. 9. With reference to my mention of this masquerade in *My Lady Castlemaine*, p. 116, Lady Baillie-Hamilton points out to me that it should probably be identified with the "great masque at Court," mentioned by Evelyn, on July 2nd, 1663, five months previous to the Gramont-Hamilton wedding, not with that on Candlemas Day (February 2nd), 1665. This certainly removes a difficulty in connection with Gramont's account.

P. 159, l. 12. Gramont speaks as if the Duchess took four new maids of honour (overlooking her retention of Mary Blague), but only mentions two at first, Frances Jennings and Anne Temple. He introduces Arabella Churchill later.

P. 163, l. 26. See *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1663-4, p. 414, etc.

P. 164, l. 4. Gramont's "Mlle. Levingston" is the same as "My Lady Betty Levingstone" in this letter of Lord Cornbury. Mr. Fea in his edition of the *Memoirs* says that nothing appears to be known of this lady—except that it has been surmised that she was the "B. L." in *Letters of Philip, Earl of Chesterfield*, pp. 153-6. We know, however, that she was daughter of James Levingstone or Livingstone, Viscount Newburgh, a person of considerable importance at the court of Charles II., who in 1655 was reported to be about to take Anne Hyde as his second wife.

P. 168, l. 1. *Diary*, June 10th, 1666.

P. 169, l. 6. *H.M.C., XII., App., Pt. 7, Le Fleming MSS.* Sir George Fletcher writes to Daniel Fletcher, December 30th, 1662, that "Mr Jermyn is banished from the Court for courting Lady Castlemaine."

P. 172, l. 10. Peter Cunningham, in his appendix to the *Story of Nell Gwynn*, on Gramont's chronology, says: "It is known that the earliest printed edition of Ovid's *Epistles* in English verse was published in 1680, sixteen years too late to have suggested to Miss Jennings her parody on the 'Epistle of Ariadne to Theseus,' addressed to the perfidious Jermyn, and containing a description of the perils and monsters that awaited him in Guinea. Perhaps, after all, no reference whatever was intended to a printed edition, and the word 'published' must be taken in its ordinary sense of *circulated*, though not commonly applied to what is *printed*."

P. 172, l. 22. Rupert wrote of the dangers to which he and his fleet were exposed at Portsmouth of receiving affronts from the Dutch, and in reply was ordered to lie up at Cowes. Pepys comments (October 24th, 1664): "Much beneath the prowesse of the Prince, I think, and the honour of the nation, at the first to be found to secure themselves." On October 31st Pepys says: "This day I hear young Mr. Stanley, a brave

young [gentleman], that went out with young Jermin, with Prince Rupert, is already dead of the small-pox at Portsmouth."

P. 173, l. 27. See p. 524 above.

P. 175, l. 5. Carte refers especially to the case of Sir Robert Nugent (*Ormond*, IV., 450). For this affair see p. 236 above.

P. 175, l. 22. The first Earl (also Hugh Montgomery) died in 1663.

P. 176, l. 4. Sir Brian O'Neil was afterwards Justice of the King's Bench in Ireland, and was attainted by the Prince of Orange in 1691.

P. 176, footnote. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, III. (New Series). Letters of July 2nd and August 13th, 1664. In the former Moore calls Talbot "Sir John." In the other he mentions Gilbert's marriage to Lady Loftus, about which see Appendix B.

P. 177, l. 4. *Continuation*, III., 116-124.

P. 178, l. 5. The Duke of York had come back to London on December 4th (see Pepys for that date), and this interview between him, the King, and Clarendon, according to the last-named, was followed by Talbot's arrest the same night, *i.e.*, it took place on December 22nd.

P. 179, l. 21. The warrant is among the Danby Papers (*H.M.C.*, *XI.*, *Leeds MSS.*). *British Museum Additional MS.* 1328 says that in December, 1664, "Colonel Richard Talbot was committed to the Tower by the King for using threatening words touching the Duke of Ormonde; because the Duke would have introduced an exception, in the new Act of Settlement, of all such as had received decrees in the Court of Claims, either by perjury or bribery."

P. 179, footnote. Gramont was on a second visit to London at the time of Richard Talbot's second imprisonment in the Tower; for on January 18th/28th, 1665, Cominges writes to Louis XIV. that the Chevalier has been there again for two months. But clearly some of the details of Gramont's story are merely picturesque inventions. He says that he offered Talbot to act as his "resident" with Miss Elizabeth Hamilton during his absence in Ireland, and that Talbot replied: "My dear Chevalier, I am so much obliged to you for your offer that I resign you my mistress and will send you your money instantly." Now Gramont had himself married Elizabeth Hamilton in December, 1663, and on the following October 24th/November 3rd, 1664, took her and their recently born child to France. It is truly astonishing how inaccurate are the *Memoirs of Gramont* where they deal with events concerning the Comtesse.

P. 181, l. 26. *H.M.C.*, *Egmont MSS.*, Vol. II.

P. 182, l. 26. Macaulay's account of Talbot's imprisonment and release is very characteristic. (He only appears to know of one commitment, after a threat to murder Ormonde.) "The bravo was sent to the Tower," he says: "but in a few days he was again swaggering about the galleries, and carrying billets backward and forward between his

patron and the ugliest maids of honour." The art of the partisan is charmingly illustrated in this last touch—founded, of course, on a jest of Charles II. against his brother.

P. 185, l. 29. Gramont says "a German doctor," but Burnet gives the name Alexander Bendo, and says "an Italian mountebank." (*Life of Rochester.*)

P. 186, l. 16. See Mr. Wheatley's *Pepys and the World he Lived in*, on the subject of oranges.

P. 187, l. 23. As is mentioned elsewhere, Ralph Jennings of Islington married a sister of Sir William Brounker, knight, and their son Sir John Jennings I. took as his second wife a daughter of the same. This Sir William's younger brother Sir Henry, also a knight, was the father of William, first Viscount Brounker. The last-named had two sons, William and Henry, second and third viscounts in their turn. Thus the Henry Brounker in the text was two generations, senior to Frances Jennings, being second cousin to her grandfather Sir John Jennings II.

P. 187, l. 26. Brounker is said to have performed for the Duke of York the offices which Burnet imputed to Richard Talbot. See Pepys, *Diary*, June 10th, 1666. He fell into disgrace with the Duke and was dismissed from his post of Groom of the Bedchamber in August, 1667, for some bold words which he was heard to utter—to the effect that "he believed the King would be hectored out of everything" (Pepys, August 29th 1667)—and in the following April was ejected from the House of Commons, where he represented Romney, for his cowardice at the naval battle with the Dutch three years previously. However, he was back at Court before the end of 1668 and in favour with the King. After his dismissal by the Duke of York he had managed somehow to insinuate himself into Charles's good graces, to the detriment of his former master.

P. 188, l. 7. How good a chess-player this makes Henry Brounker to be is difficult to estimate. He came before the time of Alexander Cunningham the historian (1654-1737), inventor of the Cunningham Gambit, and the other Alexander Cunningham, of Block (born between 1650 and 1660), reputed to be "the best player at chess in Europe." On these two, see an article by Mr. H. J. R. Murray, *British Chess Magazine*, April 1912.

P. 190, l. 28. The letters from the French envoys may all be found in M. J. J. Jusserand's *A French Ambassador at the Court of Charles II.*

P. 192, l. 9. Pepys, *Diary*, May 17th, 1665.

P. 196, l. 2. Henry Savile writes to his sister-in-law, Lady Dorothy, at the beginning of June, 1665: "The only volonteers that are gone lately are my Lord Rochester, George Hamilton, and Sir Thomas Clifford." (*Savile Correspondence*, p. 7.)

P. 196, l. 12. In *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1664-5, is a pass, dated July 26th, 1665, for Col. Richard Talbot to Ireland with eight horses. If he actually went at this date, then of course the whole story of his conduct on the

ride to York, etc., is apocryphal. But we do not actually hear of Talbot's presence in Dublin until August 18th. See p. 221.

P. 197, l. 2. Burnet's scurrilous tales against the Duchess and Sidney should not be taken as history, in spite of the fact that Pepys on November 17th, 1665, heard "how the Duchess is fallen in love with her new Master of the Horse, one Harry Sidney." Pepys's informant was Lord Sandwich, whose kinsman Ralph Montagu had been Sidney's predecessor in the Mastership of the Horse. Ralph Montagu was a man capable of any ill act or speech, and doubtless spread the story about his successor. Sir John Reresby, who was at least an honest gentleman and had at the same time good reason to know what he was writing about says: "The Duchess . . . was a very handsome woman and had a great deal of wit, therefore it was not without reason that Mr Sidney, the handsomest youth of his time, was so much in love with her as appeared to us all, and the Duchess not unkind to him, but very innocently." (*Memoirs*, p. 64.)

P. 197, l. 13. Gramont's confusion of dates is greater still, for in chapter X. he passes straight from the visit of the Court to Tunbridge Wells in 1663 (with a few touches introduced from the Queen's visit in 1665) to the ride to York in August, 1665. And the Guinea Expedition he introduces, as if later, at the end of the *Memoirs*.

P. 200, l. 9. On February 22nd of the same year Pepys and Mr. Alsopp, the King's brewer, spend an hour together "talking and bewailing the posture of things at present; the King led away by half-a-dozen men, that none of his serious servants and friends can come at him. These are Lauderdale, Buckingham, Hamilton, Fitzharding, . . . Progers . . . and Sir H. Bennet." Hamilton here must be James, the King's Groom of the Bedchamber.

P. 200, l. 14. An allusion to this grant may be found in *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, II. (Old Series), pp. 336-7, from which it appears that, though made under the Great Seal of Ireland on January 14th, 1664, it had not been enforced nor had produced any profit to the licensers up to 1671.

P. 200, l. 15. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1663-4.

P. 201, l. 22. Pepys, *Diary*, July 7th, 1667.

P. 203, l. 15. Lord Arlington to Lord Sandwich, October, 1667 (*Arlington's Letters*, I., 185).

P. 203, l. 23. This is shown by *Cal. St. P.*, *Domestic*. In April, 1673, Edmund Ashton petitions that, having lately received a commission as lieutenant of the King's troop of Guards to succeed Sir T. Sandys, he finds the place full, and that when Sir George Hamilton and Sir Gilbert Gerard left, their pay was ordered to be continued to the Duke of Monmouth on his giving them respectively 1,500*l.* and 1,200*l.*, which moneys were advanced by Sir Stephen Fox (Paymaster of the Forces). On September 24th, 1670, there is a warrant to Sir Stephen Fox to pay

600*l.* to Sir George Hamilton, the same to be placed to "this month's account of the forces."

P. 204, l. 3. Henry Savile to Sir George Savile, September 17th, 1667 (*Savile Correspondence*, 22.)

P. 204, l. 14. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *Pt.* 7, *Le Fleming MSS.*

P. 204, l. 19. A letter from Dover on February 2nd, 1668, mentions that Sir George Hamilton, with 100 men and horses, has sailed for the Downs. This is in *Cal. St. P.*, *Domestic*. See also the entries for January 14th and 20th, 1668.

P. 205, l. 23. *Cal. St. P.*, *Ireland*, 1669-70. In *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1668-9, also, is another warrant to the Vice-Treasurer of May 3rd, 1669. "We have promised," says His Majesty, "to give 4,000*l.* to Catherine Boynton, Maid of Honour to the Queen, in consideration of her services and the merits of her father, Colonel Matthew Boynton, who was killed in the late King's service, and also to promote her marriage with Colonel Richard Talbot. You are to pay the money from the revenues of Ireland, one moiety during the present year, the other in the year 1670." (An unfinished draught of the same warrant puts the grant at £6,000 instead of £4,000.) From a warrant of May 13th, 1671, it seems that the second moiety was not paid until then.

P. 206, l. 9. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 7, *Le Fleming MSS.*

P. 206, l. 23. In connection with what I wrote in *My Lady Castlemaine*, p. 117, Lady Baillie-Hamilton suggests that the story of the ride of the Hamilton brothers to Dover in pursuit of the Chevalier owes its origin to a letter written by Lord Melfort to Richard Hamilton in 1689-90, twenty-six years after the alleged incident. But Cominges's Court news-sheet to Louis, in August 1663, is strong evidence of Gramont having been at least dilatory in carrying out his engagement to the beautiful Elizabeth. Why this should have been so, we cannot say; for he clearly admired her extremely.

P. 207, l. 10. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*

P. 208, l. 18. *H.M.C.*, *Buccleugh MSS.*, I. Letter of January 18th, 1670.

P. 210, l. 1. *Ib.* Letter of March 17th, 1670. Montagu writes to Arlington of "Your Lordship's letter to me by Sir George Hamilton." Arlington had employed the returning Hamilton as his carrier; but the letter does not survive.

P. 211, ll. 9, 15. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*

P. 212, l. 3. Matthew O'Conor, *Military Memoirs of the Irish Nation*, p. 87.

P. 212, l. 7. This is shown by Lord Arlington's letter of September 7th, 1671, to Sir William Godolphin, English Ambassador at Madrid: "The Conde de Molina complains to us of certain levies Sir George Hamilton hath made in Ireland. The King hath always told him, he had no express license for it; and I have told the Conde he must not find it strange that a gentleman, who hath been bred the King's Page

abroad, and losing his employment at home for being a Roman Catholic, should have some more than ordinary connivance towards the making his fortune abroad, by the countenance of his friends and relations in Ireland; and yet, take the matter in the worst sense he could give, it would not amount to the breach of any article betwixt the King my Master and the Crown of Spain." (*Arlington's Letters*, II., 332-3).

P. 212, l. 10. *Cal. St. P., Dom.* Letter of September 5th, 1671.

P. 213, l. 7. On October 8th (old style) Dr. William Denton writes to Sir Ralph Verney: "They fought from 9 o'clock till night parted them. . . . Sir George Hamilton, that married our cousin Jenins, had 3 wounds, his horse shot, and his regiment shattered cruelly." (*H.M.C., VII., App., Verney MSS.*)

P. 213, ll. 13 *ff.* A letter to Sir Joseph Williamson from Dover, on December 24th, 1674, says: "About 8 this morning arrived the *Anne* yacht from Dieppe, bringing over Lord Duras, Count Hamilton, and Count Grammont, who are this afternoon gone for London." Another letter of March 3rd, 1675, announces the sailing of the *Cleveland* yacht the previous night with "Lord Hamilton," Gramont, and others on board. (*Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1673-5.) In the index to this volume of the *State Papers* this English visit is attributed to "Count Anthony Hamilton." But Anthony is never described as "Count" or "Lord" Hamilton at this period. When he was made a Count by Louis XIV. is uncertain, but it was apparently after his retirement to Saint Germain. He had indeed made a journey from France—in 1673; but he had then gone to Limerick, where we hear of him with a captain's commission recruiting for his brother's regiment. (See *Dictionary of National Biography*, under Anthony Hamilton.) I must confess, however, that I am unable to account for the military historians' conviction that George Hamilton personally led his regiment at Turkheim and received his brigadiership as a reward for his gallantry there.

P. 214, l. 14. *H.M.C., IV., App., Bath MSS.* Letter of November 8th/18th, 1674.

P. 214, l. 24. Marquise Campana de Cavelli, *Les Derniers Stuarts à Saint-Germain en Laye*, I., 164-5. Letter from the archives of the Ministère des Affaires étrangères de France.

P. 216, l. 18. *Cal. St. P., Dom.* A letter dated Chester, January 5th, 1676, mentions Count Hamilton's departure from Holyhead to Dublin on the previous Saturday. A Portsmouth letter of April 13th announces the arrival and departure of "Lord Hamilton, bound for France to his command."

P. 217, l. 13. For instance, Sir Bernard Burke in *The Rise of Great Families*.

P. 217, l. 22. *H.M.C., IV., App., Bath MSS.*

P. 218, l. 1. Madame de Sévigné to Madame de Grignan, July 1st and 6th, 1676.

P. 218, l. 12. *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1676-7. In the index the grant is wrongly referred to "Hamilton, Sir George, deceased, Mary, relict of." Sir George Hamilton, senior, did not die until 1679.

P. 219, l. 1. *Ib.*

P. 219, l. 8. *Ib.*, 1677-8.

P. 220, l. 7. *H.M.C., XII., App., Pt.* 5, *Rutland MSS.*, II. Lady Chaworth writes to Lord Roos on November 23rd, 1676: "Mis Jennings and her daughter, maid of honour to the Dutchesse, have had so great a falling-out that they fought; the young one complained to the D[uchess] that if her mother was not put out of St. James's, where she had lodgings to sanctuary her from debt, she would run away, so Sir Alleyn Apsley was sent to bid the mother remoove, who answered with all her heart she should never dispute the Duke and Dutchesse's commands, but with the grace of God she would take her daughter away, for two of the maids had had great bellies att Court, and she would not leave her child there to have the third; so, rather than part with her, the mother must stay, and all breaches are made up againe." On December 25th Lady Chaworth writes again: "Mis Sarah Jennings hath got the better of her mother, who is commanded to leave the Court and her daughter in itt, notwithstanding the mother's petition that she might have her girle with her, the girle saying she is a mad woman."

P. 220, l. 24. In a letter of December 29th, 1687, preserved in the British Museum, the Princess Anne writes to her sister Mary: "One thing more I must say for her, which is that she has a true sense of the doctrines of our Church, and abhors all the principles of the Church of Rome, so that in this particular I assure you she will never change."

P. 221, l. 7. *Cal. St. P., Ireland*, 1663-5.

P. 222, l. 9. *Ib.*, 1666-9, undated letter assigned to 1666 (p. 257).

P. 222, l. 19. *Ib.*, letter of August 21st, 1666. On the 11th Orrery wrote to Viscount Conway, asking him to pay him a visit at Charleville. "Here will be several of your hearty servants; amongst others Dick Talbot, who I daresay only on the account of your own merit does faithfully love and heartily honour you."

P. 223, l. 10. On Buckingham's machinations against the Duke of York at this time see Pepys, *Diary*, November 16th, 1667.

P. 224, l. 18. *Cal. St. P., Dom.* Letter from Robert Francis to Williamson, September 7th, 1668.

P. 225, l. 15. *Diary*, January 16th, 1669.

P. 225, l. 23. *Ormond*, IV., 428.

P. 226, footnote. *Cal. St. P., Ireland*, 1669-70, p. 643.

P. 227, l. 7. *Ormond*, IV., 429.

P. 228, l. 18. *Spic. Oss.*, I., 471. Peter Talbot's letter of February 25th/March 6th, 1669, to the Nuncio at Brussels. Talbot writes in Latin.

P. 230, ll 3 *ff*. *Ormond*, IV., 430-1.

P. 230, footnote. *Cal. St. P.*, *Ireland*, *Addenda*, 1625-70. The letter is dated May 2nd, 1670, which is perhaps an error. The Talbots could scarcely have "fallen from their hopes" before they had even tested Berkeley's attitude.

P. 233, footnote. Letter quoted in Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 436.

. 234, l. 18. The first mention which I have found of *Sir* William Talbot is on May 20th, 1671 (*Cal. Treasury Books*, 1669-72).

P. 234, l. 21. *Cal. St. P.*, *Ireland*, 1669-70. Resolution of November 25th, 1670.

P. 235, footnote. *Cal. St. P.*, *Ireland*, 1663-5. Letter of June 13th, 1663.

P. 236, l. 13. *H.M.C.*, *MSS. of House of Lords*. A note is added to the report: "After full argument before the Committee for petitions, agreed by 11 votes to 6 to be reported to the Lords." Carte mentions the case, *Ormond*, IV., 450.

P. 237, l. 16. The date of his departure is fixed by a letter of December 6th, from Sir George Rawdon to Viscount Conway. (*Cal. St. P.*, *Ireland*, 1669-70.)

P. 238, ll. 4 *ff*. *See Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1671, under dates January 18th, 22nd (Arlington's letter). Carte's very full, but not always very clear, narrative of the whole affair of the petition, in *Ormond*, IV., 452 *ff*, is the basis of our account.

P. 240, l. 17. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1671. Letter of July 8th. Five days later Sir George Rawdon writes to Viscount Conway: "Colonel Talbot is come over, but the commission of inspection is not yet come, and it is not thought here it will signify much."

P. 241, l. 8. *Ib.* Letter of February 14th.

P. 241, footnote. *H.M.C.*, *Egmont MSS.*, Vol. II. Letter of May 16th, 1682. In the same volume is a letter from Robert Bowyer in Dublin to Sir Robert Southwell on March 7th, 1670. "We heard," says Bowyer, "little or nothing by the last post concerning Talbot's petition (for so it is called), only that one Col. Verney was set on by five Irishmen, one of their names was Flaherty, who beat the Colonel very sadly for speaking (as they said) against Col. Talbot."

P. 244, l. 10. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1671, pp. 34-5.

P. 244, l. 16. Patrick Moore's letter of July 2nd, 1664 (*H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, III., New Series), throws suspicion on the sincerity of Orrery's friendship for Ormonde even then. It also shows that the Talbots, as early as 1664, were supposed to be "all for Orrery" as "a patriot to the Pale." He was, of course, that year connected with them by his sister's marriage to Gilbert.

P. 245, l. 5. See a remarkable letter from Viscount Conway to Sir George Rawdon, March 15th, 1670, in *Rawdon Papers*, pp. 239-41, where we have Orrery's account of his relations with Lauderdale, Buckingham, etc.

P. 245, l. 28. Essex, when Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, refused to pass Ranelagh's accounts, and in 1681 a decree was given against him and his partners for no less than £76,000; but King Charles remitted it.

P. 246, l. 6. Viscount Conway to Sir G. Rawdon, December 28th, 1677 (*Rawdon Papers*).

P. 248, l. 16. *Cal. St. P., Dom.* Letter of May 27th, 1672.

P. 249, l. 25. *Rawdon Papers*, pp. 252-4.

P. 250, ll. 13 *ff.* *Cal. St. P., Dom.* Letters to Williamson on October 19th and 26th, and November 2nd, 1672.

P. 251, l. 3. A note by Williamson in *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, belonging to March, 1673, runs: "Talbot admitted in Ireland intended to break the S[ettlement]." Lord O'Brien's paper already quoted, p. 219*n*, says that "the getting Papists into the Commission of the Peace, and their admission into the corporations, was the product of this conjunction betwixt Lord Ranelagh and Col. Talbot."

P. 251, l. 7. *Ib.*, p. 109. Letter of Sir Henry Ingoldsby.

P. 251, footnote. Letter of November 14th, 1673, quoted in *Spic. Oss.*, II., 222-3.

P. 252, l. 14. Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 477-8. Already Richard Talbot had been mentioned in the House of Lords. See *H.M.C., VII., App., Verney MSS.* Dr. William Denton writes to Sir R. Verney on March 20th, 1673, that on the previous Tuesday the Lords "brought in a wonderful modest paper of grievances which [they] submitted to His Majesty's pleasure." In the matter of Ireland "Lord Arran, being desired by the Committee, gave a very good and a very modest account. Dick Talbot they have branded," etc.

P. 253, l. 19. *Cal. St. P., Dom.* Letter of April 19th, 1673.

P. 254, l. 28. *Letters to Sir Joseph Williamson*, I., 68. On June 6th Ball had written that the Lord-Lieutenant gave Peter Talbot the choice of quitting the kingdom or standing on his own vindication.

P. 255, l. 8. *Ib.*, I., 42.

P. 255, l. 22. *H.M.C., VII., App., Verney MSS.* Cp. letter of September 25th, 1673, from the same writer. Talbot's pass to transport himself beyond the seas, with servants, etc., was issued on September 19th (*Cal. St. P., Dom.*).

P. 256, l. 4. E.g. *Letters to Williamson*, II., 26. But the reference given in a note thereon to Marvel's *Advice to a Painter* (1673) appears erroneous. In the earliest known editions of that lampoon, the lines put in James's mouth appear as:

"Most holy Father! being join'd in league
With Father Patrick, D—— [not Talbot], and with Teague."

P. 256, l. 28. *H.M.C., Ormonde MSS.*, III (New Series). Letter of November 16th, 1674.

P. 257, l. 5. *H.M.C.*, *VII.*, *App.*, *Verney MSS.*, Denton to Sir R. Verney, March 30th, 1676. "Talbot, the priest, is come over again."

P. 257, l. 10. Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 54.

P. 258, ll. 16 *ff.* See the passages quoted in *My Lady Castlemaine*, pp. 200-1.

P. 259, l. 20. Courtin to Louis, October, 1676 (Campana de Cavelli, *Les Derniers Stuarts*, I., 180, from the archives of the French Ministère des Affaires étrangères). "The King," says Courtin, "repeated to me what he had already told me," etc.

P. 260, l. 22. *Ib.*, I., 143, from the Este archives at Modena.

P. 261, l. 3. As to his objections see his *Memoirs* in Macpherson's *Original Papers*, I., 80.

P. 261, l. 19. *Derniers Stuarts*, I., 201-2. Barillon to Louis, November 1st, 1677.

P. 262, l. 12. Dr. Edward Lake, *Diary*, 1677-8.

P. 262, l. 19. *Derniers Stuarts*, I., 203. Letter of November 11th/21st, 1677.

P. 262, l. 26. *Ib.*, I., 205. Letter of December 13th/23rd, 1677.

P. 266, l. 26. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. IV. (New Series), p. 362. The document enclosed in "W.'s" letter is dated February 5th, 1679. It attacks Ormonde vigorously for his friendship with Roman Catholics implicated in the "horrid plot." The first article gives the story reproduced in the text. Among the other articles those which are of interest to us are as follows:

(5) Ormonde sent to Captain Bryan the 10th of October, to take Peter Talbot, who was at Colonel Talbot's. The Captain took the Colonel's word and left Peter Talbot and his papers; the 11th of October the Duke came to Kilkenny, and had Peter Talbot brought to town, but not his papers.

(6) Accuses Ormonde of consulting Colonel Talbot about disarming the Papists and of drawing up the proclamation for that purpose as Talbot agreed to it.

(11) There was a proclamation forbidding Papists to have houses in Dublin, yet that week Colonel Talbot and the Earl of Clanricarde took houses there.

(12) Various Roman Catholic peers are constantly advised with, and so are the Talbots, about all affairs, and specially about the Protestant religion.

P. 267, l. 27. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. II. (Old Series). Letter of October 10th, 1678.

P. 268, footnote. *Ib.*, Letters of October 13th, December 7th, 1678.

P. 269, l. 2. *Ormond*, IV., 550.

P. 269, l. 9. See the document quoted above.

P. 269, l. 16. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. II. (Old Series).

P. 270, l. 15. The order for the apprehension of the three is dated Whitehall, November 5th, 1678, and is endorsed by Ormonde as received November 12th. The main portion of it is as follows:—

"Right trusty and right entirely beloved cousin and counsellor, wee greet you well. Whereas there has been further information given us upon oath, touching a rebellion designed in Ireland, whereby it appeares that Richard Talbot was to be General, the Viscount Montgarret to be Lieutenant-Generall, and John Pippard a Colonell: and that they have received and accepted their severall commissions from the Provinciall of the Jesuits by vertue of a breve from the Pope, as by affidavit made by Titus Otes more fully appears. And it being further informed that the commission to the said Viscount Montgarret, in regard of his indisposition, was to be executed by his eldest son, we do therefore authorize and require you forthwith to cause the said Richard Talbot, the Viscount Montgarret's eldest son and the said John Pippard to be immediately apprehended, and kept in safe custody until further order; and also to cause the said severall persons to be strictly examined to the points aforesaid, and to such others as you in your discretion shall think fit, and their examinations, with an account of your proceedings herein, to return to us so soon as conveniently it may be done. . . .

(Signed) "By His Majestie's command, HENRY COVENTRY."

(*H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. I., Old Series.)

P. 270, l. 26. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. IV. (New Series). Letter of November 12th, 1678. See also Ormonde's letter to his brother-in-law, Captain Matthew, on the same day.

P. 271, l. 14. *Ib.*, Vol. VI. (New Series). Ormonde to Arran, August 21st, 1681.

P. 271, l. 21. The exact date of this lampoon is uncertain, but it must have been written between 1673 and 1678 (when Marvel died).

P. 272, l. 3. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. IV. (New Series).

P. 272, l. 17. *Ib.*, Vol. V. (New Series).

P. 273, l. 1. *Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1677-8, p. 335.

P. 273, l. 13. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. V. (New Series), p. 233. Cp. p. 197.

P. 273, l. 22. Carte, *Ormond*, IV., 577.

P. 274, l. 7. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. V. (New Series). Viscount Lanesborough to Ormonde, Dublin, October 25th, 1680: "M[r] Turner tells me Peter Talbot is past recovery." Ormonde himself, writing to Lord Sunderland from Dublin on November 23rd, says that for two or three posts he had forgotten to acquaint him that Peter Talbot is dead.

P, 279, l. 5. *Derniers Stuarts*, I., 213 *ff.*

P. 281, ll. 25 *ff.* Preston's despatches and other details of the affair are to be found in *H.M.C.*, *VII.*, *App.*, *MSS. of Sir F. Graham.*

P. 283, l. 22. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. VI. (New Series), pp. 540-2.

P. 285, l. 6. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. VI. (New Series). Letter of February 17th, 1683.

P. 287, l. 1. G. S. Steinman (*Althorp Memoirs*, biography of Frances Jennings) notes that the portrait by Michael Wright at Malahide Castle of the two sisters is incorrectly inscribed "The *Ladies* Catherine and Charlotte Talbot." Katherine (or Catherine) died too early to be thus styled.

P. 287, l. 11. I have not been able to consult the registers of Christchurch Cathedral personally. According to an article on Richard Talbot in the *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, 1857, they show that the Talbots had several children born to them in Dublin. The writer of the article, following Burke's *Dormant and Extinct Peerages*, states that two of Richard's daughters by Frances grew up, one being the Lady Charlotte, who married the Prince of Ventimiglia. What happened to the other he does not say; nor does Burke. See the last chapter of the present work.

P. 290, l. 2. *Ormond*, IV., 668-9.

P. 293, l. 15. *Ib.*, IV., 674.

P. 293, l. 20. *Ib.*, IV., 671 *ff.*

P. 294, l. 23. *Ib.*, IV., 276. On p. 293 Carte says of James's attitude towards Ormonde that he "seemed always to stand in awe of him; and whatever esteem he could not help having of him, and whatever grateful sense he entertained at some times of his services, yet he never really cared for him, purely on account of his being a zealous Protestant." James in his *Memoirs* claims to have been a good friend to Ormonde in 1668, when there was a conspiracy at Court against him. See the extract in Macpherson's *Original Papers*, I., 49. Macpherson also quotes affectionate letters from James, as Duke of York, to Ormonde (*ib.*, I., 42-4).

P. 295, l. 6. Luttrell, *Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs*, 1678-1714.

P. 295, l. 13. *Derniers Stuart*, II., 39.

P. 296, l. 22. The four ladies-in-waiting at the Coronation were Lady Sophia Bulkeley, the Countess of Bantry, Mrs. Bromley, and Mrs. Margaret Dawson.

P. 298, l. 22. *H.M.C.*, *V.*, *App.*, *Malet MSS.*, p. 319. Tyrconnel to James II., Dublin, August 29th, 1685.

P. 299, footnote. *The State of the Protestants in Ireland under the late King James's Government*, by Dr. William King, Dean of St. Patrick's, afterwards Bishop of Londonderry and Archbishop of Dublin. The date affixed to this letter of the Irish Clergy is "the — of July, 1685."

P. 301, l. 20. *State Letters of Henry Earl of Clarendon* (edition of 1765). Letter of January 23rd, 1686.

P. 303, l. 1. Tyrconnel was at Bath in the autumn of 1663 (*Cal. St. P., Ireland*, 1663-5. Sir G. Lane to Secretary Bennet, October 14th, 1663);

in 1668 (see p. 224 above); and in the spring of 1686. Concerning the last visit Clarendon writes to Rochester on April 24th that a Captain Robert Fitz-Gerald had recently "spent a fortnight at the Bath with Lord Tyrconnel" (*State Letters*).

P. 304, l. 15. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 5, p. 102. Peregrine Bertie to Countess of Rutland, January 28th, 1686: "My Lord Ossory [Ormonde's grandson] has a windfall of 6,000*l.* by my Lord Arran's death. His place of Marshall of Ireland is now given to my Lord Tarconning."

P. 305, l. 8. *State Letters*, Clarendon to Rochester, February 20th, 1686.

P. 305, footnote. *Ib.*, letters of January 19th, February 9th, 1686.

P. 306, l. 9. This quotation from the *Memoirs* is preserved in Clarke's *Life*, II., 77.

P. 307, footnote. Letters of March 13th and 20th, 1678.

P. 308, l. 4. *Savile Papers*, p. 49. H. Savile to Lord Halifax, May 8th 1677.

P. 308, l. 13. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., pp. 88-91.

P. 308, l. 29. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 5. Letter of February 6th (O. S.), 1686. Barillon's letter referred to in the preceding note, it must be remembered, is dated according to the New Style.

P. 309, l. 14. In connection with James's behaviour towards his wife now, it is interesting to recall the justifiable indignation of John Paget, author of *The New Examen*, over Macaulay's discriminating treatment of James and William as unfaithful husbands. "Both these monarchs," says Paget, "were unfaithful to their wives. Lord Macaulay records the 'highly criminal' passion of James for Arabella Churchill and for Catherine Sedley, sneering contemptuously at the plain features of the one and the lean form and haggard countenance of the other, but forgetting the charms recorded in the *Memoirs* of Gramont as those to which the former owed her power, and whilst admitting the talents which the latter inherited from her father, denying any capacity in the King to appreciate them. William, on the other hand, married to a young, beautiful, and faithful wife, to whose devotion he owed a crown, in return for which she only asked the affection which he had withheld for years, maintained during the whole of his married life an illicit connection with Elizabeth Villiers (who squinted abominably), upon whom he settled an estate of £25,000 a year, making her brother a peer, whose wife he introduced to the confidence of the Queen, and Lord Macaulay passes it over as an instance of the commerce of superior minds! In James, conjugal infidelity is a coarse and degrading vice; in William, it is an intellectual indulgence, hardly deserving serious reprehension." (*New Examen*, pp. 3-4.)

P. 310, l. 6. *State Letters.* February 27th, 1686.

P. 310, l. 17. *Ib.*, Clarendon to Rochester, March 9th, 1686.

P. 312, l. 5. *Ib.*, April 13th, 1686.

P. 312, l. 20, and p. 313, footnote. *Ib.*, March 23rd and May 11th, 1686.

P. 313, l. 14. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, II. (Old Series). Ormonde to Southwell, April 29th, 1686: "The Earl of Tyrconnel got here on Tuesday night." The other letter to Southwell is dated May 26th.

P. 314, l. 13. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 5, *Rutland MSS.*, p. 109. Concerning Patrick Trent or Trant, Clarendon had written to Rochester as early as April 6th, 1686: "Mr Trant, I hear, comes over with my Lord T——, in order, I suppose, to be somebody."

Pp. 316 *ff.* For the events mentioned in this chapter see *State Letters*, I., Clarendon's letters of June 5th, 8th, 12th, 15th, 19th, 22nd; July 6th, 20th, 22nd, 31st; August 5th, 14th, 16th, 22nd, 24th, 26th.

P. 321, l. 4. The Royal Hospital of King Charles II. for Ancient and Maimed Officers and Soldiers of the Army of Ireland. Tyrconnel is later accused of having "subverted" this and turned out the inmates (*Cal. St. P.*, *Dom.*, 1695, p. 180.)

P. 324, l. 7. On June 15th Clarendon writes: "I could tell you many stories of him and of his carriage towards particular persons, who have complained to me; but I will not yet take notice of any of those, nor of any thing, but continue a perfect diary of what passes between my lord Tyrconnel and me; which at one time or other may perhaps be proper to be shewed. But indeed I fear his violent, extravagant temper may hurt the King's business: for the particular slights he puts upon me, I am sure, I will take no notice of them to any one living, though some of them are pretty publick; but there is nothing I will not do or bear for the King's service. Nor will I trouble you with the idle stories of the adoration which is paid him. Let time and patience shew all."

P. 327, l. 13. With regard to Tyrconnel's "reform" of the army, the not too poetical person who wrote *The Irish Hudibras* has the following lines:

> "The Roman tribe would be too strong,
> If this good luck should last too long.
> How many gallant troops this sot
> Will he condemn unto the pot?
> How many fitter to command,
> And soldiers too, will he disband,
> And carry on a sly intrigue
> To make a vacancy for Teague?"

P. 328, ll. 18*ff.* This account is taken from Clarendon's two letters on the same date, July 22nd, 1686, to his brother and to Sunderland.

P. 330, l. 9. See p. 399 *n.* above. It is absurd to suppose, on the strength of King's statement quoted there, that "Lying Dick Talbot" was a commonly accepted nickname. The "everybody" of the violent partisan only means his own friends. We find the nickname nowhere else.

P. 331, footnote. "My sister Frank," *i.e.*, Frances Hyde, who married Sir Thomas Knightley.

P. 332, l. 4. Price, the Receiver General of Ireland, was one of the people whom Tyrconnel, when he went over to England in January, threatened to "have out" (Clarendon's letter to Rochester, March 14th, 1686). He was accused of having pretended to pay out money when he had as a matter of fact kept it himself. Price need not necessarily have been innocent because Tyrconnel considered him guilty; though Tyrconnel's enemies seem to have acted upon this assumption.

P. 333, l. 2. Clarendon to Rochester, July 31st, 1686: "The truth is, says Mr Nihill, my Lord Tyrconnel's temper is very inconvenient. He is hot and passionate, and sometimes reports things which light people tell him, without enquiring or considering; and if he takes a pique at a man, though he may pretend to be reconciled, he has a sly way, and will never leave till he had ruined him, if he can. Faith, Mr Nihill, says the Chancellor, if that be the humour of my Lord Tyrconnel, it is an ill one; and I will hereafter be more upon my guard when I am with him."

P. 333, l. 21. Clarendon calls him Nangle; but of the two alternative spellings of this Anglo-Norman name in Ireland Nagle appears to have been proper to this man's branch of the family. (See Dalton, *King James's Army List*, I., 160-1.) It is in a letter to Ormonde in May, 1686, that Clarendon speaks of Richard Nagle's honesty and ability. Similarly to Rochester in August he describes him as "a very able man and therefore the more to be watched."

P. 334, l. 3. See Clarendon's letter of May 30th, 1686, to James II.

P. 341, l. 17. Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 148.

P. 342, l. 1. *Ib.*, I., 244. Similarly, in the passage quoted above (p. 306) from Clarke's *Life of James II.*, the non-fulfilment of the promise "made my Lord Tyrconnel expostulate with my Lord Sunderland, the delay of his part of that contrivance [*sc.* the compact between them], and threaten'd to acquaint His Majesty with the whole design, if not speedily comply'd with."

P. 342, l. 18. Clarendon to Rochester, September 23rd, 1686. This was written, it must be remembered, long before Sheridan disgraced himself by swindling as Secretary of State, etc. in Ireland. Macaulay appears to consider Sheridan a perfectly trustworthy authority as to Tyrconnel. Relying on him, he says that the King "received, by the penny post, many anonymous letters filled with calumnies against the Lord Treasurer," a mode of attack "contrived by Tyrconnel, and in perfect harmony with every part of his infamous life." Relying on him again, he says that "Mary of Modena herself was not free from suspicion of corruption" by Tyrconnel and goes on to tell of a chain of pearls, valued at £10,000 and once the property of Prince Rupert, with which Tyrconnel loudly boasted that he had purchased the support of the

Queen. It is true that Macaulay adds: "There were those, however, who suspected that this story was one of Dick Talbot's truths,* and that it had no more foundation than the calamnies which, twenty-six years before, he had invented to blacken the fame of Anne Hyde." If the two accusations against Tyrconnel, with regard to the Queen and to Anne Hyde, are admitted to be supported by equally good evidence, then defenders of Tyrconnel may rest content.

P. 343, l. 5. See the letters of Terriesi, Tuscan envoy in London, September 7th/17th and 14th/24th, 1685, in *Les Derniers Stuarts*, I., 74-5.

P. 343, l. 7. *H.M.C.*, *VII.*, *App.*, *Verney MSS.*, Dr. William Denton to Sir R. Verney, October 19th, 1686.

P. 343, ll. 17-8. Clarendon to Rochester, October 12th, 1686: "My Lord Tyrconnel doubts not but before Christmas I shall be recalled, and that either himself or Lord Dover shall succeed." Same to same, November 2nd: [It is reported that] "at a private juncto the King was very much pressed to make Lord Tyrconnel Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, but that it was much opposed by the Roman Catholic lords and so came to no resolution."

P. 343, l. 24. Same to same, November 27th, 1686.

P. 343, l. 28. See his letter to her, November 24th, 1686.

P. 346, l. 1. *British Museum Additional MSS.*, 4194, *f.* 91.

P. 346, l. 16. Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 148.

P. 347, l. 8. Nagle to Tyrconnel, Coventry, October 26th, 1686. This is printed in the Appendix to Gilbert's edition of *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland*. It was evidently an open letter. See King, *State of the Protestants*, 163.

P. 347, l. 24. Macpherson, I., 149-50.

P. 348, l. 11. Letter of January 8th, 1687.

P. 349, l. 12. *B.M. Add. MSS.*, 4194, *ff.* 134.

P. 351, l. 11. *H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, II. (Old Series). Concerning Ormonde someone writes to John Ellis on January 4th: "Old Or. is gone to Hampton Court, breakes apace, and is much out of humour" (*B. M. Add. MSS.*, 4194, *f.* 130).

P. 352, footnote. King, *State of the Protestants*, Appendix.

P. 354, l. 10. *Ib.*, p. 163. Nagle in his Coventry Letter had written: "I confess I cannot comprehend the necessity of such a declaration, notwithstanding the reasons insisted upon for the support of such a project. Your Lordship may well remember what a numberless number of proclamations issued in the late King's time, that had no other operation upon the minds of the people than to put them in mind that the Prince was in fear of them, which made many often to appear the more violent

* "At Whitehall any wild fiction was commonly designated as one of Dick Talbot's truths," we are informed in an earlier passage.

to cross his designs." Tyrconnel's full sympathy with, if not direct inspiration of, the Coventry Letter is obvious.

P. 354, l. 24. *B.M. Add. MSS.*, 4194, *f.* 132. A correspondent of John Ellis writes on January 11th, 1688: "Those following [?] are now made Privy Councill^rs there, viz. the Ld Visco^t Nettervile, Lord Louth, Lord Bellew, Sr Wm Talbot, Coll. Richd Butler, Mr Antho. Hamilton, Mr Thomas Sheridan (who by the by comes his L^pp's Secretary, which I doubt will spoyl the pretensions of y^r Bro. Will for that place, and long of his own ill management for ought I know in not gratifying the [? Papists])." This letter is much worn and difficult to read.

P. 355, l. 12. It is to be noted how closely Tyrconnel's action in Ireland followed the lines laid down in the letter to James II. found among Bishop Tyrrel's papers and printed in the Appendix to King's *State of the Protestants*. One passage in this letter (which is dated August 14th, 1686) runs as follows: "As matters now stand, there is but one safe and sure expedient, that is, to purge without delay the rest of your Irish army, increase and make it wholly Catholick, raise and train a Catholick militia there; place Catholicks at the helm of that kingdom; issue out *quo-warrantos* against all the corporations in it; put all employs, civil as well as military, into Catholick hands. This done, call a Parliament of loyal [subjects]." Cp. also the scheme attributed to Peter Talbot in 1671 (Appendix C.).

P. 355, l. 20. Luttrell gives James's itinerary and says: "At Chester the Earl of Tyrconnel, Lord Deputy of Ireland, arrived and went to wait on His Majesty at Shrewsbury."

P. 356, l. 9. Barillon to Louis, September 6th/16th, 1687.

P. 356, l. 18. *Ib.*, October 6th/16th, 1687. In this same letter Barillon says that Sunderland told him that King James was resolved to reverse the Settlement. We can quite believe that Sunderland told Barillon this. No lie should surprise us in his mouth.

P. 359, l. 18. Seignelay to Bonrepos, September 19th/29th, 1687.

P. 360, footnote. *State Letters*, Clarendon to Rochester, December 30th, 1686.

P. 362, l. 27. *H.M.C., XIV., App., Pt.* 2, *Portland MSS.*

P. 364, l. 3. Luttrell mentions the return of Nugent and Rice to Ireland towards the end of April, 1688. King's account of their mission (*State of the Protestants*, 163-4) is as follows: "In Spring, 1688, he [Tyrconnel] sends over to England Chief Justice Nugent and Baron Rice, to concert the methods of repealing it. That this was their errand was publickly known, and is confessed by my Lord Sunderland in his Letter to his Friend in London, dated March 23rd, 1689, and if we believe him, they bid 40,000*l.* to gain his Lordship to assist them; but whatever his Lordship did with them, it is certain they succeeded in their design (tho' perhaps a little delay'd in point of time) and agreed upon the several steps by which they were to bring it to pass; they knew it was generally

discoursed that they went on this errand, and it would have alarmed the whole kingdom if they had owned their success; they therefore dissembled it and contrived to have it given out that the King had rejected their proposals but granted others that were very beneficial to that kingdom, the heads of which they took care to have published." It is, of course, quite untrue that Nugent and Rice "succeeded in their design." James fought desperately for more than a year longer against the repeal of the Acts of Settlement and finally gave way in 1689, practically under duress. But Lord Macaulay is willing to believe even the Sunderland of whom he draws so scathing a picture, when he is useful as a witness against James. He says that Sunderland in 1688 "attempted to convince the King that Tyrconnel's scheme of confiscating the property of the English colonists in Ireland was full of danger, and had, with the help of Powis and Bellasyse, so far succeeded that the execution of the design had been postponed for another year."

P. 364, l. 22. Burnet, *History of My Own Time*, Supplement published in 1902, p. 255.

P. 365, ll. 5-6. Luttrell in his entry under February, 1688, says: "Letters from Ireland speak of a difference between the Lord Deputy there and Mr Sheridan the secretary, the latter being accused of bribery."

P. 365, l. 15. Charles's friendship for him is evinced in a letter which he wrote to Ormonde on March 24th, 1681, sending it by the hand of Sheridan. "I was very willing to give this bearer a letter to you," says the King, "to tell you that tho he has been in some trouble by the last House of Commons, yett he stands very right in my opinion, and I thought it reasonable to give him this testimony that he does endeavour all he can to serve me, and you know he has very good tallents severall ways to do it." (*H.M.C.*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. I., Old Series). Mr. E. I. Carlyle, who writes the life of Thomas Sheridan in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, says that he was Collector of Customs at Cork in 1670 or later. Ormonde would in that case know something about him.

P. 366, l. 4. *History of William III.* (edition of 1702), pp. 146-9.

P. 366, l. 24. Sheridan is also said to have married a natural daughter of James II. If so, she must have been his second wife.

P. 368, l. 24. The author of *A Jacobite Narrative* says: "His Majesty was a sincere Christian, suspecting no evil of anybody whom he had not *de facto* found to be bad, and believing that everyone entrusted by him would prove honest and diligent in discharge of his trust, which made him acquiesce often to the opinion of those who commonly were about his person, and of whose integrity and ability he had a former esteem."

P. 368, l. 26. The Thomas Sheridan who was made a baronet in 1726 by James III., was the son of Tyrconnel's enemy. He accompanied Prince Charles to Scotland in 1745.

P. 369, l. 7. William Ellis's name appears on proclamations from Dublin Castle in June, 1688. King mentions him as a Protestant Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland in June, 1690 (*State of the Protestants*, Appendix). In that year he was appointed Assessor of the City and County of Dublin.

P. 369, l. 18. Pope pillories him as such in his *Sober Advice from Horace;* and in some lines entitled *The Town Life* he is called "that epitome of lewdness, Ellys" (*Dictionary of National Biography*). He had, nevertheless, friends of the utmost respectability, such as Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich. Prideaux's *Letters*, published by the Camden Society, are addressed to him.

P. 369, l. 25. *B. M. Add. MSS.*, 4,194, *f.* 132, quoted above in the note on p. 354, l. 24.

P. 370, l. 14. We might add the Earl of Roscommon, uncle by marriage to his first wife's sister Isabella. Richard Hamilton was on the Privy Council both before and after the period of which we are writing here, but was at this time still absent from Ireland.

P. 372, l. 5. "A great *Furioso*, and can prescribe no limits to his passion" (*The Secret Intrigues of the Romish Party in Ireland*).

P. 374, l. 4. *Letters of Rachel Lady Russell*, quoted in Steinman's *Althorp Memoirs.*

P. 374, ll. 10 *ff.* Rosse was a Protestant, like his ancestors, but a loyalist. Both Dillon and Kingsland were outlawed by William. Dillon's mother was Mary, daughter of Sir Henry Talbot of Mount Talbot, county Roscommon, and therefore a kinswoman of Tyrconnel. Kingsland's mother was Mary Nugent, daughter of the third Earl of Westmeath; and his grandmother Bridget, widow of Rory O'Donnel, Earl of Tyrconnel of the old line.

P. 375, l. 21. *H.M.C., XIII., App., Pt.* 2, *Portland MSS.*, p. 52.

P. 376, l. 17. See *Observator*, August 23rd, 1682.

P. 377, l. 7. Louis XIV., writing to Barillon on January 9th, 1688, expresses his just indignation at Burnet's attacks on James, and says that he has told the Sieur de Croissy to assure Sir Bevill Skelton (the English Ambassador in Paris) that "whoever undertakes to capture him in Holland will find not only an assured retreat and entire protection in my dominions, but also all the assistance he can desire in conducting this scoundrel to England" (*Derniers Stuarts*, II., 157). Luttrell, under March, 1688, speaks of an attempt made in Holland upon Sir Robert Hamilton by mistake for Dr. Burnet, of the offer of a reward of 1,000 guilders by the States-General for the discovery of the guilty parties, and of the grant of some soldiers to guard Burnet's house. A few lines later he has the significant entry: "Several libells and pamphlets have been lately printed and sent about; many are come over from Holland."

P. 377, l. 17. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 182. Hoffmann to the Emperor, April 2nd, 1688.

P. 377, footnote. King James in his *Memoirs* (Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 157) has the following: "Mrs Dawson being sent for by the Princess of Denmark to come to her, when she was dressing herself to go to her sister's coronation, she asked Mrs Dawson if really the child, which was called her brother, was the Queen's child? Mrs Dawson answered her it was; and that she could answer for it, so much as she could answer that she, the Princess, was the late Duchess's, having seen them both born. . . . This I had from a gentlewoman who had it from Mrs Dawson."

P. 378, l. 13. Ailesbury, *Memoirs*, I., 172. He leaves the inventors and believers of the scandals to "their deserved wretched destiny." Unhappily historians have let them off very lightly. Yet even Luttrell at the time found that "people give themselves a great liberty in discoursing about the young prince, with strange reflections not fitt to be inserted here."

P. 379, l. 21. *An Account of the Conduct of the Duchess of Marlborough* (1742), p. 16. She says that King James attempted to convert his daughter Anne, and that "Lord Tyrconnel also, who had married my sister, took some pains with me to engage me, if possible, to make use, for the same end, of that great favour which he knew I enjoyed with the Princess: but all his endeavours proved vain."

P. 380, l. 9. The Tuscan envoy at Whitehall, Terriesi, writes home on January 2nd (new style), 1688: "The anger cannot be expressed which the Princess of Denmark feels over this pregnancy [of the Queen], which she cannot in any way disguise. (*Derniers Stuarts*, II., 156.)

P. 380, ll. 10 *ff.* King James's *Memoirs* in Macpherson, I., 151, 155; Clarendon's *Diary*, October 23rd, 1688.

P. 381, l. 2. *Memoirs*, I., 185. He mentions also the Prince of Denmark and the Duke of Grafton (both of whom we might expect to believe anything); and the Duke of Ormonde. The last named was destined to die within a few weeks, in his seventy-eighth year, and can therefore scarcely be considered a responsible person at this date.

P. 381, footnote. This epitaph is printed in *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 9, *MSS. of R. W. Ketton Esq.*

P. 382, l. 3. *H.M.C.*, *XII.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 4, *Belvoir MSS.* Newsletter to the Countess of Rutland, August 25th, 1688.

P. 382, l. 6. Both these publications are dated 1688. The author of the second has no justification for questioning Richard Talbot's connection, however far back, with the English Talbots.

P. 384, l. 4. *H.M.C.*, *XI.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 5, *Dartmouth MSS.* Letter of June 18th, 1688.

P. 385, l. 3. *Ib.* An estimate dated October 26th, 1688, gives the number of King James's forces in England as follows: English, 34,320; Scots, 2,981; Irish, 2,816.

P. 385, l. 13. *B.M. Add. MSS.*, 21,483 *f.* 34, holograph, unsigned.

P. 385, footnote. *H.M.C., V., MSS. of Sir A. Malet.*

P. 386, l. 22. *Cal. St. P., Ireland*, 1660-62. Richard Talbot to Secretary Bennet, December 13th, 1662.

P. 389, l. 16. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 264-5, etc.

P. 391, l. 6. James says in his *Memoirs*: "The King of France sent M. de Bonrepos, to convince the King of his danger. The King thought this last a contrivance to frighten him into an alliance with France. The Dutch ambassadours deny any design against England." He goes on to state that Sunderland had persuaded him that d'Avaux's memorial to the States in August was but a French stratagem and so got him to reject all advice from France. (Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 153-4.)

P. 391, l. 13. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 274, *ff.* Seignelay's letter to Barillon, p. 300, justifies this remark. Cp. pp. 320-1.

P. 392, l. 23. Clarendon's *Diary*, October 16th, 1688.

P. 393, l. 10. According to his *Memoirs* (Macpherson, I., 162) James "once intended to secure Churchill and the Duke of Grafton, and have them sent to Portsmouth; but, on further consideration, did not think fit to do it." This clemency, or negligence, is inexplicable. As early as in his speech to the assembled lords at Whitehall, November 27th, the King showed that he knew all about Churchill's plot to surrender him. See Clarendon's *Diary* for that day.

P. 393, ll. 12, 20. *H.M.C., VII., App., MSS. of Sir F. Graham.*

P. 394, l. 8. *Ib., XI., App., Pt.* 5, *Dartmouth MSS.* Letter of December 15th, 1688.

P. 395, ll. 4, 8. *Ib.* Letter of Philip Musgrave in London to Lord Dartmouth, November 22nd, 1688. "Great complaints are come from Ireland of the arms sent thither from Chester and not without cause; those sent from hence are not much better." The intercepted letter is mentioned, *ib., XIV., App., Pt.* 9, *Lindsey MSS.* (Danby to Latimer, December 17th, 1688).

P. 395, l. 24. The letter, dated December 3rd, 1688, and endorsed "Direct this with care and haste to my Lord Montgomery," was as follows: "Good my Lord, I have written to let you know that all our Irishmen through Ireland are sworn that on the 9th day of this month, being Sunday next, they are to fall on, to kill and murder man, wife, and child, and to spare none; and I do desire your Lordship to take care of your self and all others that are adjudged by our men to be heads; for whoever of them can kill any of you is to have a captain's place. So my desire to Your Honour is to look to your self, and to give other noblemen warning, and go not out at night or day without a good guard with

you ; and let no Irishman come near you, whatever he be. This is all from him, who is your friend and father's friend, and will be, though I dare not be known as yet, for fear of my life."

P. 396, l. 13. *B. M. Add. MSS.*, 36, 296.

P. 396, l. 17. See Keating's letter quoted below.

P. 396, l. 24. John Phillips before the House of Lords Committee.

P. 397, l. 2. *H.M.C., XII., App., Pt.* 6, *House of Lords MSS.*

P. 399, l. 2. King, *State of the Protestants*, Appendix. Letter of December 29th, 1688. "If there be faith to be found in man, the Lord Deputy and Roman Catholick nobility and gentry of the kingdom, who are universally concerned in the present army, and in that which is to be raised, will, upon the first signification of His Majesty's [King James's] pleasure to that purpose, unanimously disband, retire to their several dwellings, and apply themselves to advance the quiet and wealth of the kingdom." It is noteworthy that this letter of Keating's is very different in tone from those which the witness Robert Rochfort told the House of Lords he had seen, written by Keating to Sir John Temple about the beginning of January, "desiring that no forces might be sent into Ireland ; for if forces came Tyrconnel would let loose 40,000 of his myrmidons to eat up the Protestants."

P. 399, l. 12. Phillips's and Luke King's evidence before the Committee.

P. 400, l. 13. Lieutenant-Colonel Brennigan, another witness, stated that "about the time Colonel Hamilton came into Ireland Tyrconnel was in a bad way. He bought up all the guineas at high rates and pulled down the hangings ; they thought, in order to be gone."

P. 400, l. 27. William Nugent was Tyrconnel's great nephew, not his nephew, having married a daughter of Sir Thomas Newcomen by Tyrconnel's sister Frances. He was the youngest son of Richard, second Earl of Westmeath, and a nephew therefore of Chief Justice Nugent.

P. 402, l. 4. 4,940, according to the figures in the list in King William's Chest at the Record Office. Tyrconnel's troops sent over from Ireland were not all Roman Catholics, but even if 3,000 of them were so (Ailesbury's estimate, in his *Memoirs*, that the number of Roman Catholics in the whole army in England then was not 1,200, is obviously wrong, unless he is excluding the Irish) there was little enough cause for a nation to be alarmed at them. Yet the Mayor of Canterbury told Ailesbury that he had not been in bed for three nights for fear of having his throat cut by the Irish Papists!

P. 402, l. 11. *H.M.C., XIV., App., Pt.* 4, *Kenyon MSS.* Roger Kenyon to the Earl of Derby, December 18th, 1688.

P. 404, l. 9. Lord Macaulay's description of the affair is as follows: "Richard Hamilton not only made his own peace with what was now the ruling power, but declared himself confident that, if he were sent to Dublin, he could conduct the negotiation which had been opened there

to a happy close. If he failed, he pledged his word to return to London in three weeks. His influence in Ireland was known to be great: his honour had never been questioned; and he was highly esteemed by John Temple. The young statesman declared that he would answer for his friend Richard as for himself. This guarantee was thought sufficient; and Hamilton set out for Ireland, proclaiming everywhere that he should soon bring Tyrconnel to reason. The offers which he was authorised to make to the Roman Catholics and personally to the Lord Deputy were most liberal." I have not been able to trace the authority for all these statements of Lord Macaulay.

P. 404, l. 10. Luttrell mentions the news that Hamilton was not returning at the beginning of February, 1689.

P. 404, l. 25. The wording of Temple's last message is not identical in Luttrell and in Clarendon (*Diary*, April 19th), but the two versions agree substantially. Luttrell gives the following as the supposed reason of the suicide: "He [Temple] had engaged the King not to send over any forces for Ireland, assuring him that he had that interest with the Lord Tyrconnel's secretary, who informed him that Tyrconnel would surrender that kingdom if the King sent over no forces thither; but finding he had been deceived, and that they only pretended that till they had fortified that kingdom, and that His Majesty's reducing that kingdom would be very difficult thereby, he committed this fact upon himself."

Charles Hatton writes to his brother the Viscount on April 23rd about Temple's suicide: "The occasion of his writing those words he left in the boate hath raised much discourse here in town. The discharge of the office of Secretarie of Warr is not a difficult taske. . . . Therefore the discharge of that office cou'd not bee the foolish undertaking what he cou'd not performe he soe fatally lamented. But I am inclined to beleeve it wase his undertaking that Tyrconnel would deliver up Ireland upon articles, for I am told by a very intelligent person that the Lord Chief Justice of Ireland, who came here from Tyrconnel, did, according to his instructions, apply himself to Mr Temple's relations, and Mr Temple negotiated that affaire, and being imposed on with false assurances that, if Major-Generall Hamilton was sent into Ireland with advantagious proposall to Tyrconnel, he would deliver up that kingdom, and the expence of sending over men might be saved, Mr Temple, beeing soe imposed on, did with great earnestness assert his opinion; which being proved to bee erronious by the event some hasty and inconsiderate personns did say some few dayes since to Mr Temple that all the blood shed in recovering Ireland wou'd call for vengeance from him and his family; the reflection on which made him, who wase naturally very melancolly, take that fatall resolution." (*Hatton Correspondence*, II., 133.)

P. 405, l. 26. *H.M.C., XII., House of Lords MSS.*, p. 189.

P. 408, l. 14. Archbishop Marsh says that he and others, hearing that Hamilton had come over to persuade the Lord Deputy to recede from the government, "thought him an unfit man and wondered how he came to be sent."

P. 411, ll. 8, 9. Luttrell gives these figures on the testimony of "Irish letters."

P. 414, l. 1. The French translation is reproduced by the Marquise Campana di Cavelli, *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 535-6.

P. 418, l. 23. King (*State of the Protestants*, 123) says that Tyrconnel sent for Mountjoy and persuaded him to go to James in France, to represent to him the weakness of Ireland, and the necessity to yield to the time and wait a better opportunity. He "swore most solemnly that he was in earnest in this message; and that he knew the Court of France would oppose it with all their power; for, said he, That Court minds nothing but their own interest, and they would not care if Ireland were sunk to the pit of Hell (they are his own words), so they could give the Prince of Orange but three months' diversion; but, he added, if the King be persuaded to ruin his fastest friends to do himself no service, only to gratifie France, he is neither so merciful nor so wise as I believe him to be. If he recover England, Ireland will fall in course, but he can never expect to conquer England by Ireland; if he attempts it he ruins Ireland to do himself no kindness, but rather to exasperate England the more against him and make his restoration impossible; and he intimated that if the King would not do it he would look on his refusal to be forced on him by those in whose power he was, and that he would think himself obliged to do it without his consent."

King, it may be observed, credits Tyrconnel with admirable insight, both into the minds of Louis and his advisers, and into the attitude of England toward James's restoration.

P. 419, l. 4. I have not seen the original of King James's letter, which is quoted by Mr. Boulger, *The Battle of the Boyne*, p. 42. For Pointis's instructions see *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 529.

P. 419, l. 29. The *Jacobite Narrative* says that "in the space of two months above fifty thousand enlisted themselves for the war, and each company and troop of the whole number was subsisted upon the cost of every captain for three months, to the undoing of several officers who were not lords of land nor possessed of any great treasure." With the last statement compare what Tyrconnel says in his letter to King James on January 29th.

P. 420, l, 16. In spite of what King says, the disarmament was not universal, or else it would not have been necessary for James to give similar orders in July and again in October.

P. 420, footnote. The secret commissions given to Rizzini are in *Les Derniers Stuarts*, II., 407-13, being reproduced from the Este archives at Modena.

Notes

P. 422, l. 18. In the *Jacobite Narrative* (p. 45) Hamilton's force is reckoned at 3,500 men.

P. 425, l. 9. Macpherson, *Original Papers*, II., 327 *ff.*

P. 426, l. 16. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 574-5, from *Bibl. Imp. MSS.* 12,160, *ff.* 130-1.

P. 426, footnote. *Camden Society Publications*, XIV. (Old Series).

P. 428, l. 19. 10,000 muskets were promised. Mr. Boulger, *Battle of the Boyne*, p. 54, extracts from the French War Office lists the totals supposed to have been taken by Maumont (3,000 swords, 16,000 sabres, 19,000 belts, 600 pairs of pistols, 500 single pistols, 500 muskets, and 500 guns) and adds: "It is very dubious if even this mixed assortment of weapons was ever sent in its entirety." The list should be compared with what Tyrconnel asked for in his letter of January 29th, 1689, and the one that followed it.

P. 428, l. 21. The French official list of passengers by Gabaret's fleet gives only 83 names, exclusive of King James, Lady Melfort, and the various suites of servants; and of these 83 not all are military men—to take only one instance, there is Chief Baron Rice. But this French list must omit the names of many British officers of the lower grades. Both General Roze (in his letter to Louvois, March 16th/26th, 1689) and Tyrconnel (in his letter to the Duke of Hamilton) speak of 200 officers coming from Brest.

P. 429, l. 1. In the list in the Appendix to King's *State of the Protestants*, however, this captain appears as "Gowen" Talbot.

P. 430, footnote. *Derniers Stuarts*, II., 544-50.

P. 435, l. 16. Dalton, *King James's Army List*, I., 293-4, from *D'Avaux's Negotiations*, etc.

P. 433, l. 20. From a Jacobite journal quoted in Macpherson, *Original Papers*.

P. 434, l. 7. Melfort himself, when in Paris in the autumn of 1689, says (Macpherson, I., 328): "All who come from England rail against me as a traitor and a Sunderland, or worse, if that can be." They accused him of hindering King James from going to England because he himself was afraid of going thither. The Irish, on the other hand, accused him of endeavouring to ruin the expedition to Ireland in order to persuade the King to go to England or Scotland. And it may be noted that Sir George Mackenzie, on a visit to Lord Clarendon at Cornbury on September 19th, 1689, told his host that "if King James had come into Scotland when Lord Dundee was alive, or had sent 5,000 men thither, the whole kingdom would have gone in to him. He said my Lord Melfort has ruined the King, and would suffer nothing to come to him but what came from his party" (Clarendon's *Diary*).

P. 434, l. 20. *Mémoire Justificatif du Comte de Melfort*, Macpherson, II., 674.

P. 435, l. 3. D'Avaux, April 8th/18th, 1689. It is in a letter two days previous to this that d'Avaux declares of Tyrconnel that, "if he were a born Frenchman, he could not be more zealous for the interests of France."

P. 436, l. 4. *H.M.C., Buccleugh MSS.*, II., Pt. 1, p. 36. What he wrote to the Earl of Perth is in much the same strain. He adds: "If Your Lordship be a prisoner, and that this do come into your hands, it will be some consolation to you to hear that your King has yet some friends that will stick by him; if you be at liberty you will make the right use of this good news for your master's service." Luttrell, in his entry for April 24th, says: "The Lords sent down to the Commons several letters from the late King James and the Lord Tyrconnel (which His Majesty had communicated to them) to several persons in Scotland, and which had been lately taken there with one Brady: they made considerable discoveries of King James's designs."

P. 440, l. 7. The correction of 30 to 13 is made by J. C. O'Callaghan in his edition of *Macariæ Excidium*. It may be noted that John Stevens, writing in his *Journal* in the spring of 1690, says that the Grand Prior's regiment (in which he was then a lieutenant) consisted of 22 companies, none of them full, and was reduced therefore to 13 companies.

P. 440, l. 13. *H.M.C., VIII., MSS. of Lord Talbot de Malahide.* On April 3rd Tyrconnel, still in Dublin, writes: "I this morneing had yours of the 23rd [wh]ich the King read, as he dos all yours, . . . and is mightily well satisfied with [what you] doe." In an undated letter, partly in French, he says: "*Je nay jamais douté de vostre tendresse, mon cher frère, et rien ne me fait tant de peine que le peu d'apparence qu'il y a que nous nous voyons bien tost.*"

P. 441, l. 6. *Ib., XII., App., Pt. 7, Le Fleming MSS.* Newsletter of May 30th, 1689.

P. 441, l. 22. *Macariæ Excidium.* "You observe here," says the *Jacobite Narrative*, in connection with James's journey, "the return Londonderry made the King for all the pains he had taken in travelling so far in order to gain those rebels with lenity. But 'tis what he always gets from Protestants generally. No experience will make him behave himself towards those traitors as he should do. He spoiled his business in Ireland by his over great indulgence towards them." It is very instructive to compare what this fervent Roman Catholic says with William King's view of the matter as shown in his *State of the Protestants.*

P. 443, l. 1. The eight Protestants were the Bishops of Meath (Anthony Dopping), Ossory (Thomas Otway), Cork (Edward Wettenhall), and Limerick (Simon Digby); the Earls of Barrymore, Granard, and Longford; and Lady Tyrconnel's son-in-law, Viscount Rosse.

P. 443, l. 11. Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 170.

P. 443, l. 14. Even Lord Macaulay admits the moderating influence of Tyrconnel here. "It was not without difficulty," he says, "that Avaux and Tyrconnel, whose influence in the Lower House far exceeded the King's, could restrain the zeal of the majority."

P. 444, l. 23. James himself speaks of his "hopes of recompensing such Protestants as suffered by the act for rescinding the acts of settlement" as inducing him to consent to the Act of Repeal (Macpherson, as above). In a Declaration which he issued on April 17th, 1693, he showed how little he had been converted to the policy which was forced on him in Dublin in 1689. Speaking of his intention of summoning an English Parliament, if he should be recalled, he added: "And in that parliament we will also consent to everything they shall think necessary to re-establish the late act of settlement of Ireland, made in the reign of our dearest brother; and will advise with them how to recompense such of that nation as have followed us to the last, and who may suffer by the said re-establishment, according to the degree of their sufferings, thereby; yet so as the said act of settlement may always remain entire." This Declaration much offended the Irish exiles on the Continent.

P. 444, l. 24. *State of the Protestants*, 177. According to King, one of those who attempted to take advantage of the reprisal clause and were unfairly defeated was Sir Thomas Newcomen. Was this the reason why Newcomen so soon deserted to the Prince of Orange?

P. 445, l. 4. John Stevens urges the same objection against the Act of Repeal: "The Protestants, who before might have perhaps stood neuter or hoped for some reconciliation, their estates being taken away were in a manner necessitated to espouse the rebellion."

P. 445, l. 14. *H.M.C., XII., Pt. 6, House of Lords MSS.*, p. 228.

P. 447, l. 9. The author of *Macariæ Excidium* speaks of the little esteem which "the great ones at Court" had for the base coinage, "Tyrconnel's lady commonly giving double the quantity of brass for so much silver."

P. 448, l. 8. *Account*, etc., pp. 16-7. This work was published in London in 1690.

P. 449, l. 11. *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1689-90. The letter, which was in cipher, was intercepted and appears enclosed in a communication from Dr. John Wallis (who deciphered it) to the Earl of Nottingham on August 10th, 1689.

P. 452, l. 25. Letter of July 5th/15th, 1689.

P. 453, l. 20. The loss outside Londonderry was, however, much heavier, being estimated as high as 8,000.

P. 453, l. 24. When James sent Lord Dover to France, he wrote that the coming invasion of Ireland by the forces of the Prince of Orange had "made us change the design we had of going immediately into England for that of preserving Ireland" (Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 312).

P. 455, l. 7. I have written "any recommendation from a responsible person," because Leslie, in his *Answer to King*, does make an accusation against some of the discontented Irish that they moved to King James for leave to cut off the Protestants, "which he return'd with indignation and amazement, saying, 'What, gentlemen, are you for nother Forty-One?' Which so gall'd them, that they ever after look'd upon him with a jealous eye, and thought him, tho' a Roman Catholick, too much of an Englishman to carry on their business. And I am told by persons coming from thence that the generality of the Irish Papists do at this day lay all their misfortunes upon King James, because he would not follow their measures, and so was inclinable to favour the Protestants."

P. 456, l. 14. As a clue to the date of Tyrconnel's definite reappearance on the scene it may be mentioned that in an unsigned and unaddressed letter in French, dated September 3rd [1689], it is said: "*Le Duc de Tirconnel, qui est convalescent, y restera* [at Dublin] *et amassera le plus de monde qu'il pourra.*" (*H.M.C., VII., App.*)

P. 456, l. 22. *Impartial History*, 16-17.

P. 457, l. 4. *Memoirs*, I., 63.

P. 458, l. 3. The account given by the King (Clarke's *Life*, II., 389) is as follows: "My Lord Melford . . . had come over . . . as sole Secretarie of State, which business he not only managed, but had undertaken even that of the War, the Ordinance, and in a word assumed all power to himself; which created such a dependance upon him as My Lord Tyrconnel could not bear, nor indeed the Irish in generall, who being naturally jealous of strangers could not suffer that one so little beloved even in his own country should ingross all the power and authority in theirs and run away with the King's favour from them all. This jealousy communicated itself to the French Ambassador, who pretending on his side to a generall direction of affairs, could not suffer the confidence, or rather preference, which the King gave My Lord Melford on most occasions. These two factions therefore uniteing (at least against him) proved too weighty for him to bear, and brought a necessity upon the King of dismissing him from his employments, and out of the Kingdom too, and the same reasons obliged the Queen not to keep him at S[t] Germains neither; for had he remain'd there and all affairs gon through his hands, the jealousie would rather have encreased than abated."

P. 459, ll. 20 *ff.* Melfort's letters are published in Macpherson, I., pp. 319 *ff*, from the *Carte* and *Nairne Papers* in the Bodleian Library.

P. 463, l. 21. These Instructions are in Macpherson, I., 341-3, from the *Nairne Papers*, D.N., I., *f.* 76. In them Melfort declares that the Irish in Paris have debated "whether it be not their interest to join themselves to some Catholic crown able to protect them, rather than be subject to the revolutions of the Protestant kingdoms of Great Britain,"

most of them being of that mind. We know that this was an old Irish scheme; but the injustice of attributing it to Tyrconnel has already been shown above.

P. 466, l. 28. This is a direct quotation from the King's *Memoirs* as reproduced in Clarke's *Life*, II., 377-8.

P. 468, l. 12. *B.M. Add. MSS.*, 28,053, *f.* 398.

P. 473, l. 23. O'Callaghan in his edition of *Macariæ Excidium* (pp. 315-8) makes a tolerably successful attempt to vindicate Mountcashel's honour.

P. 474, footnote. Dalton, *King James's Irish Army List*, I., 67.

P. 476, l. 10. The Ambassador Hoffmann, writing to the Emperor on December 10th, 1688, speaks of the unwise attachment of James II. to France, and continues: "The English have taken it very badly that the Comte de Lauzun, who came over here as a volunteer, has been a member of all the councils of war at Salisbury, which is solely due to his being a Frenchman, for he has never seen military service except in a fortress" (*Derniers Stuarts*, II., 356).

P. 476, l. 23. James's later account of Lauzun's appointment, as it appears in Clarke's *Life*, II., 387-8, is scarcely complimentary to his friend; but then he had discovered his defects by bitter experience. He says that it was necessary to appoint a general in Roze's stead, "the Count de Lausun puting in for it, whose assistance in the Queen's escape from England had recommended him to her favour; and tho' no great merit was due from so accidental a piece of service, however it had gain'd him more credit and acquaintance than a meer stranger, and Her Majesty, not knowing but he might be as great a general as he affected to appear, made choice of him for this expedition." James is less ingenuous here than he usually is and omits his own share in the choice of Lauzun.

P. 476, l. 28. Macpherson, I., 316-9, from the *Nairne Papers*, D.N., I., *f.* 44.

P. 479, ll. 16 *ff.* Clarke's *Life*, II., 387-8.

P. 483, l. 19. *H.M.C., V., App., MSS. of J. R. Pyne Coffin, Esq.* Letter of Richard Lapthorne to Richard Coffin.

P. 483, l. 25. *Ib., VII., Le Fleming MSS.* Newsletter of May 20th, 1690.

P. 484, l. 7. Abbé Melani to Abbé Gondi, June 26th, 1690.

P. 485, l. 3. Dangeau, *Journal*, III., 145, under date June 12th, on the authority of letters from Ireland of May 18th. This was evidently the compromise made after the "high words." Tyrconnel found himself able to write to the Queen later: "I must doe M. de Lauzun justice to say I never saw anyone more zealous or more painful in all things relating to the King's service."

P. 485, l. 11. Clarke's *Life*, II., 388.

P. 485, footnote. Reproduced in Mr. Martin Haile's Queen Mary of Modena, p. 263, from *Autographs of Illustrious Women* (London, 1838). The date of the letter is April 5th (N.S.).

P. 486, l. 18. See Lauzun's letter to Seignelay, June 24th/July 4th, 1690.

P. 487, footnote. *B.M. Add. MSS.*, 36,296, *f.* 75. We shall in future refer to this MS. simply as Stevens's *Journal*.

P. 488, l. 9. Clarke's *Life*, II., 391-2.

P. 489, l. 8. *Ib.*, II., 393-4.

P. 489, l. 21. O'Kelly, however, though one of this section of the Irish, blames King James for risking a battle on the Boyne. He should, according to this wise-after-the-event critic, have gone back to Dublin and joined the troops left there, "where he might have three parts of the kingdom at his back to furnish him with all necessaries," while William would only have had ruined and desolate Ulster behind him.

P. 490, l. 12. Clarke's *Life*, II., 391, 393. Boulger, *Battle of the Boyne*, 142, 148. At the end of Stevens's *Journal* (*ff.* 128-30) is "An Account of His Maᵗʸˢ Royall Camp near Dundalk Fryday June the 19th 1690," which puts the total at 28,250, including reserves. Some of these we know to have been left as garrison of Drogheda under Lord Iveagh on the day of the Boyne.

Pp. 495 *ff.* King James's account of the battle is in the portion of his *Memoirs* reproduced verbatim in Clarke's *Life*, II., 395 *ff.*

P. 495, l. 12. O'Neil died of his wounds at Waterford eight days later.

P. 498, l. 11. The industry of Mr. Boulger has revealed the reports of the French officers on the happenings of the day. See *Battle of the Boyne*, 171 *ff.*

P. 499, l. 19. Clarke's *Life*, II., 398, 401-2 (verbatim).

P. 501, l. 3. *Ib.*, II., 406.

P. 503, l. 9. *Villare Hibernicum*, 11.

P. 504, ll. 5, 28. *Journal*, *ff.* 85, 86.

P. 506, ll. 2 *ff.* *Ib.*, *f.* 89.

P. 508, l. 18. *Ib.*, *ff* 89-90.

P. 510, l. 25. The French were not altogether free of suspicions against their Irish allies. The Marquis de la Houguette, writing from Galway on August 25th, 1690, concerning Boisseleau and his Irish garrison at Limerick, says: "He has to deal with such extraordinary spirits that I doubt he will discover the secret of managing them; so I shall be in fear, until the end of the siege, that they may play him some ill trick." In Clarke's *Life of James II.*, it is stated that Louis "ordered his own troops to return [to France] in pretence of a misunderstanding betwixt them and the Irish" over the desertion of Limerick by the French before the siege (II., 420).

P. 513, l. 5. *Memoirs*, I., 86-8. The account of the dissensions given in the *Jacobite Narrative* is to the following effect: Tyrconnel made his mind known to the mixed council of state and war at Limerick and desired their concurrence to make a pacific end of their troubles, leaving to Providence the restoration of their King. "Against this opinion of

Tyrconnel there rose an opposition which was sustained with vehemency by a few officers of the army, and namely by Major-General Sarsfield, by Brigadier Henry Luttrell, by Colonel Gordon Oniel, and by others." "Zeal for king and country," continues the author, "I highly commend —but it should be exhibited with discretion."

P. 514, l. 4. Clarke's *Life*, II., 413-4.

P. 515, l. 2. Stevens, who went through the siege, writes in his *Journal* on August 9th (*f.* 98): "I will not be too exact in affirming what garrison we had. I know both to encourage us & terrify the enemy, we were given out to be 15,000 strong, but I can be positive that to my knowledge we were not in all 10,000, including the unarmed men, which were a considerable number."

P. 515, l. 4. "This day [August 2nd] the French forces departed for Galway, to the great satisfaction not only of the inhabitants, but of all the garrison that remained in town. . . . Immediately upon their departure his Grace the Duke of Tyrconnel ordered it to be proclaimed that no person should presume to ask above 30s. for a Pistole, 38s. for a Guinea & 7s. 6d. for a crown in silver, pistoles before being sold for £5 in brass & silver crowns for 30 or 40s., nay this day the French marched out some of them gave a crown for each silver 3½ piece" (*Journal*, *f.* 97). The French had all along been very contemptuous in their attitude towards the base money, according to Stevens. He also shows (*f.* 94) how scornfully they treated the Irish after the Boyne, beating the soldiers and plundering both them and their officers; some of them even going so far as to wound fatally a lieutenant in the Grand Prior's regiment for challenging a saddle which they had stolen.

P. 517, l. 1. *H.M.C.*, *IX.*, *App.*, *Pt.* 2, p. 462. The name of the person to whom the letter is sent does not appear, but it is obviously Lauzun.

P. 519, l. 4. Berwick, *Memoirs*, I., 79.

P. 520, l. 22. O'Kelly characterizes as such Thomas Maxwell, Dominic Sheldon, and John Hamilton—the last named of whom was certainly as much an Irishman as Richard or any other of his brothers, however Scottish their family's origin.

P. 524, l. 21. Queen Mary's continued belief in Lauzun is shown in a letter which she wrote to him on August 15th, 1690, saying: "In the pitiable state of affairs in Ireland I ask no better than to see you safely here again and to have your advice in all our business." And this was after the Boyne!

P. 524, l. 28. This is the passage which some have interpreted as an accusation against the moral character of Frances. See pp. 13, 173.

P. 526, l. 3. Clarke, II., 422.

P. 526, l. 23. *Ib.*, II., 437-8.

P. 526, footnote. I do not know the ultimate source of this story, but it is reproduced in the *Ulster Journal of Archæology*, Vol. V., article on Richard Talbot.

P. 528, l. 5. Concerning the interviews with Louis the *Jacobite Narrative* says: "The next day after coming to Saint Germain's, the Duke of Tyrconnel went to Versailles to pay his respects to the King, who received him with great marks of esteem. The Duke in the great chamber of presence made his high acknowledgments to His Most Christian Majesty for the favours he had done to the Irish nation. The King answered that his country shall still have as much assistance as the present state of his royal affairs can admit; with that the monarch brought the Duke into his closet, where they had a private conference for an hour and a half." Dangeau mentions on October 27th (new style) Tyrconnel's arrival at Saint-Germain and the promise of his reception by Louis on the 29th. On November 10th Louis gives him a grand audience on the affairs of Ireland. On the night of November 15th/16th Tyrconnel sleeps at Versailles, and next day he has a long interview with the French King. On December 3rd he has his farewell audience, also at Versailles (*Journal*, III., 239, 247, 250, 257.).

P. 529, l. 11. *Memoirs*, I., 88 *ff.*

P. 530, l. 21. Clarke's *Life*, II., 422-5, gives James's account of the Irish deputation, though not in the form of actual extracts from the *Memoirs*.

P. 533, footnote. The lady was Lady Honora Burke (or de Burgh), a daughter of the seventh Earl of Clanricarde.

P. 535, l. 12. See p. 571.

P. 536, footnote. Clarke's *Life*, II., 434.

P. 537, l. 14. Macdonnell married Jane Nugent, youngest sister of Lord Riverston.

P. 538, l. 7. Harris, who calls Daly "a worthy judge under King James," proceeds deliberately to describe his treachery (*Life of William III.*, p. 328). To Lord Macaulay Daly is "a man of sense, moderation and *integrity*."

P. 538, l. 23. *Journal*, *f.* 114.

P. 539, l. 7. Clarke's *Life*, II., 433-4.

P. 540, l. 4. *Ib.*, II., 436-7.

P. 541, l. 2. *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1690-1. Letter of February 12th, 1691.

P. 541, l. 19. Clarke's *Life*, II., 435.

P. 542, l. 16. *Ib.*, II., 438-9.

P. 543, l. 7. *Ib.*, II., 450-1.

P. 543, l. 26. *Ib.*, II., 439-40.

P. 544, l. 13. Not "in the month of March, about the twentieth day," as the *Jacobite Narrative* erroneously states.

P. 544, l. 25. Clarke's *Life*, II., 451.

Notes

P. 545, l. 1. *An Exact Journal of the Victorious Progress of their Majesties forces, under the command of Gen. Ginckle, this Summer in Ireland* (London, 1691).

P. 545, l. 9. Clarke's *Life*, II., 451. Dangeau, on June 12th, records that Tyrconnel has written that the succours sent were very necessary and asks for money, there being none to pay the troops (*Journal*, III., 347).

P. 545, l. 19. *Ib.*, II., 452. O'Kelly says: "St. Ruth did not imagine that Tyrconnel, who was to content himself solely with the management of civil affairs, would intermeddle with the military government, James having assured him that he would write to Tyrconnel to that purpose."

P. 547, l. 21. Dr. R. H. Murray in his *Revolutionary Ireland*, p. 224, quotes from the Southwell Correspondence at Trinity College, Dublin, a letter from William Floyd, evidently written at the beginning of the second siege of Limerick, in which he says that, while the whole dependence of the Irish is on Sarsfield, "Tyrconnel and he are no great friends, and neither can he endure France."

P. 548, ll. 25-6. *Jacobite Narrative*, 131-3; Clarke's *Life*, II., 455-6.

P. 550, l. 20. Concerning St. Ruth and the subsequent action of the Nationalists the *Jacobite Narrative* says: "I cannot admire how it came to pass that the Marquis of St. Ruth was induced to connive at this unworthy procedure, the French being so much for venerating authority and quality."

P. 551, l. 23. James, as represented in Clarke's *Life*, II., 456, does not mention the direct affront to his Lord-Lieutenant, but having spoken of the disastrous differences of opinion at Athlone, says: "Here my Lord Tyrconnel left the camp and returned to Limerick. Those animosities increasing . . . he thought it more prudent to yield a while than by opiniatring increase the distemper."

P. 552, l. 20. James (Clarke's *Life*, II., 456) merely says that "some advised" this plan of campaign; but the *Jacobite Narrative* attributes it directly to Tyrconnel, and the very fact that it was rejected is a strong presumption in favour of this attribution being correct.

P. 553, l. 22. See Story, *Continuation*, 134.

P. 553, ll. 27 *ff.* Captain Parker's *Memoirs*, 30-1; *Rawdon Papers*, 358; *Jacobite Narrative*, 146-7.

P. 556, l. 6. Clarke's *Life*, II., 459.

P. 556, l. 16. See Boulger, *Battle of the Boyne*, 241-2, where some of the French reports are quoted.

P. 558, ll. 10 *ff.* Clarke's *Life*, II., 460-1.

P. 559, l. 2. *Ib.*, II., 462.

P. 560, l. 1. Dangeau, *Journal*, III., 390. Tyrconnel's message also states that "letters have been intercepted of those Irish who came this winter to complain of his conduct and to whom the King of England gave too much credit."

P. 560, l. 24. Clarke's *Correspondence.* The second letter is also published by J. T. Gilbert at the end of his edition of the *Jacobite Narrative.*

P. 560, l. 18. For Tyrconnel's will see Dalton, *King James's Army List,* I., 66.

P. 561, l. 17. The English, according to O'Kelly, gave out that Tyrconnel was "poisoned by Sarsfield and the French commanders." Story (*Continuation*, 187-8), having mentioned his death, goes on: "Which some say was not without suspition of foul play, in being poisoned with a cup of rattafeau, this is nothing but apricock-stones bruised and infused in brandy, which gives it a pleasant relish, some of which my Lord Tyrconnel had given him at an entertainment; and falling ill upon it, he often repeated the word Rattafeau, which made several believe that he had received poyson in that liquor, because he would not comply with the prevailing faction then in town. But most people say, that he died of a fever."

P. 561, l. 22. *H.M.C., VII., App., Denbigh MSS.* The recipient of the letter was probably Dykevelt, according to the editor of the MSS.

P. 563, l. 21. I am indebted for this quotation to Mr. and Mrs. Grew's *English Court in Exile*, p. 231. The letter is one of a series purchased by the British Museum in 1911.

P. 568, l. 3. C. E. Lart, *Jacobite Extracts from the Parish Registers of St. Germain-en-Laye*, I., 128; Dangeau, *Journal*, III., 340.

P. 568, l. 11. *H.M.C., XIV., App., Pt.* 2, *Portland MSS.*

P. 568, l. 15. *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1691-2, August 13th, 1692. As this entry is valuable evidence concerning the marriage of Richard Talbot and Frances, I quote it in full:

"Proceedings upon the petition of Frances, Countess-Dowager of Tyrconnel. Shows that, by indentures of lease and release bearing date the 1st and 2nd days of November 1681, in consideration of a marriage then had between her and Richard Earl of Tyrconnel, her late deceased husband, and of 10,000 crowns, her marriage portion, he, the said Richard Earl of Tyrconnel (by the name of Richard Talbot, esq.) conveyed and assured the manors of Cabragh and Taragh, and other manors and lands in Ireland, to Sir John Temple, knt., Their Majesties' Attorney-General of the said kingdom, Anthony Guidot and William Andrews, gent., and their heirs, to the use of him the said Earl for his life, and after his death to the use of the petitioner for her life, as and for her jointure, and after to other uses in the said indenture mentioned. The said Earl afterwards, in the year 1689, was outlawed and attainted of high treason, and all his manors and lands in Ireland, as well the above named as others, seized into Their Majesties' hands as forfeited. The said Earl died after the said outlawry, and thereby the petitioner became entitled to, and in right ought to have, and enjoy the said manors and lands, so settled upon her as aforesaid; but the same, by

reason of the said seizure, are detained and kept from her, and she must greatly suffer unless relieved by Her Majesty's grace and justice. Prays Her Majesty to give order that she may be let into the possession of her jointure-lands and quietly enjoy the same."

P. 569, ll. 11 *ff.* *Cal. St. P., Dom.*, 1693. Warrant of July 12th.

P. 570, l. 6. *Ib.* Letter of October 7th. The Lords Justices in the course of their letter to Nottingham said: "Lady Tyrconnel has been so very remarkable here in her acting against Their Majesties' and the Protestant interest that every one's eye is watching what is done in her concern."

P. 570, l. 27. *Ib.*, October 17th.

P. 571, l. 11. *Ib.*, October 24th.

P. 571, l. 22. *Ib.*, November 2nd.

P. 572, l. 14. Dalton, *King James's Army List*, I., 69, 72. Dangeau, under date March 20th, 1702 (*Journal*, VIII., 358), says that William has paid for some time the dowry of the widows at Saint-Germain in attendance on Queen Mary and that "the Duchess of Tyrconnel, who has a dowry of 18,000 livres, has already received it."

P. 572, l. 19. *Nairne Papers*, I., *f.* 287. As "Lady d'Almond" appears in the list under that title, it must of course have been drawn up after the honour had been conferred upon her husband and herself. In the registers of Saint-Germain she first figures as Countess of Almond in 1694 (Lart, *Jacobite Extracts*, I., 57). The name is variously mis-spelt in the registers. Her own signature is usually "Vittoria Montecucoli Davia d'Almond."

P. 573, l. 7. *H.M.C., Bath MSS.*, III., 409-10.

P. 573, l. 13. Coles, *State Papers*, 53.

P. 573, l. 17. See also *Les Derniers Stuarts*, I., where the author refutes Hamilton effectively.

P. 574, l. 10. Dangeau, *Journal*, V., 47, 83, 285-6, 305; VI., 198, 441; VII., 50, 151.

P. 574, l. 18. Lart, *Jacobite Extracts*, pp. 53, 93, 111, 134, 139.

P. 574, l. 23. *Ib.*, 26.

P. 575, l. 6. *Hatton Correspondence*, II., 249-50.

P. 576, l. 27. Macpherson, *Original Papers*, I., 695, from Lord Caryll's Correspondence, then in the Scots College, Paris.

P. 578, l. 2. *Despatches of the Duke of Marlborough*, II., 254.

P. 578, l. 18. *H.M.C., XV., App., Pt.* 4, *Portland MSS.*

P. 581, l. 16. *The Correspondence of the Duchess of Marlborough*, I., p. 122-124, has this letter of May 24th, 1708, and three others of May 14th, 17th and 31st, which mention Lady Tyrconnel.

P. 582, footnote. Pennant, *Some Account of London* (5th edition, 1813), 197-8.

P. 582, l. 11. *H.M.C., Bath MSS.*, I., 359. The name of Guydott or Guidot appears in the marriage settlement of the Tyrconnels. See the note above on p. 568, l. 15.

P. 583, l. 24. The will was dated May 26th, 1726, and was proved November 25th, 1731.

P. 584, l. 6. *Walpoliana*, II., 12.

P. 584, l. 17. The inscription ran as follows:

D. O. M.
Æternae Memoriae
Illustrissimæ et nobilissimæ Dominæ
Franciscæ Jennings
Ducissæ de Tyrconnell
Reginæ Mag. Brit. Matronæ Honorariæ
Hujus Collegii Benefactricis,
Quae Missam quotidianam in hoc sacrario
Fundavit perpetuo celebrandam
Pro anima sua et animabus D^ni Georgii
Hamilton de Abercorne Equitis Aurati
Conjugis sui primi, et D^ni Richardi Talbot
Ducis de Tyrconnell Proregis Hyberniæ
Secundi sui Conjugis.
Obiit die XVII Martii Ann. Domini
MDCCXXXI.
Requiescat in Pace.

(To the eternal memory of the most illustrious and most noble Frances Jennings, Duchess of Tyrconnel, Lady of Honour to the Queen of Great Britain, benefactress of this College, who endowed in perpetuity the daily celebration of a mass in this chapel for her own soul and for those of the Lord George Hamilton of Abercorn, Knight, her first husband, and the Lord Richard Talbot, Duke of Tyrconnel, Viceroy of Ireland, her second husband. She died on the 17th day of March, A.D. 1731.)

P. 585, l. 11. Lart's *Jacobite Extracts* (pp. 26-7) gives the marriage entry as follows: "Milord Richard Talbot, *f.* Guillaume Talbot, Comte de Tirconel, et de dame Marie Vuhite—Dame Charlotte Talbot, *ff.* defunct Richard Talbot, Duc de Tirconel, viceroy du royaume d'Irlande, et de dame Marie [*sic*] Bointon." The witnesses were Francis Plowden, Comptroller of the Household, Nicholas Cusack, James Clinton, Marie Plowden, and Bridget Nugent.

Elsewhere in the registers the name of Charlotte's mother appears, more correctly, as "Chaterine" (*ib.*, 111).

P. 585, ll. 14 *ff.* *Mawson's Obits*, reproduced in the *Genealogist*, New Series, IV., 25, gives the facts here stated.

P. 586, l. 5. *London Magazine*, 1752, p. 146. The *Scots Magazine*, 1752, p. 156, states that he died in his forty-second year. He is the "Brigadier General de Tyrconnel" mentioned in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1746, as being captured by the English at sea that year. On the abortive expedition in which he was to have taken his part in

1746 see an article by Mr. V. Hussey-Walsh in the *Quarterly Review*, October 1912, entitled "A Projected Jacobite Invasion." It appears that he was in command of the cavalry which the Duc de Richelieu was then to have taken with him into England.

P. 586, l. 14. *Jacobite Extracts*, Introduction, p. xiv.

P. 586, ll. 23 *ff*. For many of the details given here and elsewhere in this chapter see Burke's *Dormant and Extinct Peerages* and G. E. C.'s *Complete Peerage*.

P. 587, l. 2. An abstract of the will appears in Steinman's *Althorp Memoirs*, biography of Frances Jennings.

P. 588, l. 17. Is it possible that she can have been the daughter of Richard Talbot, third Earl of Tyrconnel, and therefore our Tyrconnel's granddaughter? In that case she was descended from Katherine Boynton, not Frances Jennings.

P. 588, l. 20. Dalton (*King James's Army List*, I., 72), quotes the *Montgomery MSS.* as calling "a bastard of Tyrconnel" Marcus Talbot of Dublin and County Derry, Lieutenant-Colonel of the Earl of Antrim's infantry, M.P. for Belfast in 1689, and one of the many Talbots attainted in 1691. I have met with no confirmation of this man's connection with the Duke of Tyrconnel.

P. 588, l. 28. Dangeau, *Journal*, V., 387.

P. 589, l. 16. The *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1745, p. 14, mentions two Talbots at Prestonpans.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE CHILDREN OF RICHARD JENNINGS

As the full list of the children of Richard Jennings and his wife Frances Thornhurst has never yet been set out, as far as I know, it is now here given, with such dates as can be ascertained of their births, baptisms, deaths, and burials :—

1. Susanna, baptized at St. Margaret's, Westminster, February 25th, 1645 ; buried at St. Albans, April 6th, 1655.

2. John (born ? between 1646 and 1648) ; buried at St. Albans, September 27th, 1674.

3. Frances, born ? 1649 ; died in Dublin, March 6th, 1731, and buried in St. Patrick's Cathedral.

4. Barbara, born 1650 or 1651 ; died in London, March 22nd, 1678, and buried at St. Albans.

5. Richard, baptized at St. Albans, July 5th, 1653 ; buried there June 1st, 1654.

6. Richard, baptized at St. Albans, October 12th, 1654 ; buried there August 6th, 1655.

7. Susanna, born July 11th, baptized July 19th, 1656, at St. Albans ; buried there December 30th, 1656.

8. Ralfe (Ralph), born October 16th, baptized October 20th, 1657, at St. Albans ; buried there July 15th, 1677.

9. Sarah, born June 5th, baptized June 17th, 1660, at St. Albans (died probably at Marlborough House, October 18th, 1744.

The elder Susanna's baptism is recorded in the register of St. Margaret's, Westminster, her burial in that of St. Albans Abbey. The particulars concerning John and the five younger children are from the latter registers—with the exception of the words enclosed in brackets.

The registers of St. Albans Abbey for 1558-1689 were for 137 years supposed to have been destroyed in a fire at St. Albans Rectory in 1743, but in 1880

they were discovered in a hayloft attached to a house the property of a great-grandson of John Kent, who died in 1798 after over half a century as clerk to the Abbey. They were transcribed by Mr. William Brigg and published in 1897, under the title of *The Parish Registers of St. Albans Abbey*, 1558-1689. They threw new light which was very welcome to those interested in the Jennings family.

The particulars concerning Barbara are derived from (1) the license for her marriage, which is dated April 12th, 1673, and reads: "Edward Griffith, of Inner Temple, Esq., Bach^{r}, ab^{t} 25, and Mrs Barbara Jennings, of St. Dunstan's West, Sp^{r}, ab^{t} 22, her parents dead*; at Bridewell Church or Chapel" (Harleian Society's publications, Vol. XXII., *Marriage Allegations in the Registry of the Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Canterbury* 1660-79): and (2) her epitaph on the wall near the South Door at St. Albans, which describes her as "Mrs Barbara Griffith, late wife of Edward Griffith, Esq.; daughter of Richard Jennings, late of St. Albans, Esq.; who died in London the 22nd day of March 1678, in the 27th year of her age." *Musgrave's Obituary* wrongly makes her 37 at the time of her death.

---

* This statement is curious, for Frances (Thornhurst) Jennings not only was not dead in 1673, but lived another twenty-one years.

APPENDIX B

THE CHILDREN OF SIR WILLIAM TALBOT

ALTHOUGH the names are known of the sixteen children of Sir William Talbot and his wife Alison Netterville, in some cases this is practically all that is known about them; and it seems impossible to be sure of the birth-year of any of them, including even the famous Richard. Burke's *Dormant and Extinct Peerages* arranges the sons in the following order:—Robert, John, Garrett, James, Thomas, Peter, Gilbert, Richard; and the daughters as follows:—Mary, Bridget, Margaret, Frances, Elizabeth, Jane, Catherine, Eleanor.

Of Sir Robert, second baronet of Carton or Cartown (afterwards Talbotstown), county Kildare, frequent mention has been made in the foregoing pages. Before succeeding his father* he had married Grace, daughter of George Calvert, who occupied official positions under both James I. and Charles I. and was created by the latter Lord Baltimore. By her he had a son and a daughter. The son was the "Sir William Talbot of Cartown" who was first in the remainder of his uncle Richard when he was made Earl of Tyrconnel in 1685. He became Master of the Rolls to James II. in Ireland on April 23rd, 1689, and was at least proposed as Irish Secretary of State soon after. But he died, without issue, before his uncle and consequently never inherited the earldom of Tyrconnel. His sister Frances married her kinsman Richard Talbot of Malahide, Auditor-General of Ireland in 1689. From them is descended the present Lord Talbot de Malahide.

John Talbot, of whom we have had mention, was knighted early in the reign of Charles II. He is said to have died without issue.

---

* Dalton, *King James's Irish Army List*, I., 47, says in 1634 and adds that Robert was aged 26 at the time.

Garrett has been identified with the Sir Griffith (or Griffin) Talbot, brother of the Duke of Tyrconnel, who is reported in *Musgrave's Obituary* to have died December 26th, 1723; though in that case the age of 82 there assigned to him must be incorrect, his father being seven or eight years dead in 1641. Garrett married Margaret, daughter of Henry Gawdon of county Louth, and by her had a son William, who stood second in the remainder of his uncle Tyrconnel. This William Talbot, described as of Haggardstown and also said to have been known as "Wicked Will," became the second Earl of Tyrconnel, though the title was under attainder in England. He married Mary White and had a son Richard, who married the great Tyrconnel's daughter Charlotte (Lart, *Jacobite Extracts from the Parish Registers of St. Germain-en-Laye*, I., 26). Concerning them see the last chapter of the present work.

I have not succeeded in identifying James Talbot, though there were several of that name in the period. Of the two clerical brothers Peter and Thomas we have heard frequently above, as also of Colonel Gilbert. The last, in 1664, married the elderly widow Lady Loftus, *née* Dorothy Boyle, daughter of the first Earl of Cork, and sister, therefore, of the second Earl and of Roger, Earl of Orrery (Burke; and *H. M. C. Reports*, *Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. III. (New Series), Moore's letter to Ormonde, August 13th, 1664). Dalton, *King James's Irish Army List*, I., 72, notes that after the Revolution a Jane Talbot "claimed, and was allowed, an annuity left by the will of Colonel Gilbert Talbot in 1674, and charged on houses in Limerick forfeited by Sir William Talbot."*

Of the daughters, Mary, the eldest, married Sir John Dongan, second baronet, and by him had five sons: (1) Walter, third baronet; (2) William, afterwards first Viscount Dongan of Clane and Earl of Limerick, attainted in 1691; (3) Robert, who is Gramont's "Duncan"; (4) and (5) Michael and Thomas. Mary must have been very much older than her brother Richard, since he as a boy of 17 served under her son Walter.

Bridget Talbot married John Gaydon, of Irishtown; Margaret, Henry Talbot, of Templeogue; Frances, firstly James Cusack of Cushenstown, and secondly Sir Thomas Newcomen; Eleanor, Henry O'Neil, created a baronet in 1666, their son being the Sir Neil O'Neil who was killed at the Boyne.

Dalton (although he knows that William Dongan, Earl of Limerick, was a nephew), only speaks of *two* sisters of Richard Talbot; Frances, whose two marriages and large family he notices; and Lucinda, of whom he says that she "married Edward Cusack of Lismullen, by whom she had Nicholas, a captain in this regiment [Tyrconnel's Horse], and Patrick Cusack, a Dominican friar,

---

* He also states that "Mary Talbot, a minor, sought . . . and was allowed a considerable charge on houses in Dublin, forfeited by James Talbot."

who became Bishop of Meath, and was King James's High Almoner and Grand Chaplain while he remained in this country."*

There must be a great number of descendants, living at the present day, of the first Sir William Talbot; but the task of tracing them would be one of enormous magnitude.

---

* In the list entitled "An Accompt of Lands set out to the Transplanted Irish in Connaught" in *H.M.C. Reports, Ormonde MSS.*, Vol. II. (Old Series), there appear on p. 114 the names of "Katherin Archbold *alias* Talbott, widow, and Elinor and Francis her children"—which helps to identify another of Sir William's daughters. In the Accompt appear also on p. 126 "Francis Cusacke, *alias* Talbott, Jane and Katherine Talbott, and Elinor Neale, *alias* Talbott, daughter of Sir William Talbott"; and on p. 130 "Francis Cusack, *alias* Talbott, Jane and Katherine Talbott, and Ellinor Neile, *alias* Talbott," the same four reappearing on p. 161.

Jane may be the successful claimant of Colonel Gilbert's annuity. Of Elizabeth I have found no mention outside the list given by Burke.

APPENDIX C

PETER TALBOT'S ALLEGED SCHEME FOR IRELAND

THE following document is published at the end of King's *State of the Protestants in Ireland under the late King James's Government*, under the title, "The Perswasions and Suggestions the Irish Catholicks make to His Majesty; Supposed to be drawn up by Talbot, titular Archbishop of Dublin, and found in Col. Talbot's House, July 1, 1671" :—

"1. That the rebellion in Anno 1641 was the act of a few, and out of fear of what was doing in England. That they were provoked and driven to it by the English to get their forfeitures. That they were often willing to submit to the King, and did it effectually Anno 1648; and held up his interest against the Usurper, who had murdered his father, till 1653. After which time they served His Majesty in foreign parts till his restoration.

"2. That they acquiesce in His Majesty's Declaration of November 30, 1660. And are willing that the Adventurers and Soldiers should have what is therein promised them; but what they and others have more may be resumed and disposed of as by the Declaration.

"3. They desire, for what lands intended to be restored them shall be continued to the Adventurers and Soldiers, that they may have a compensation in money out of His Majesty's new revenues of quit-rents payable by the Adventurers and Soldiers. The Hearth-money and Excise being such branches as were not in 1641; and hope that the one will balance the other.

"4. They say that His Majesty has now no more need of an army than before 1641; that the remainder of his revenue will maintain now, as well as then, what forces are necessary.

"5. They desire to be restored to habitations and freedom within Corporations. (1) That the general trade may advance. (2) That garrisons and citadels may become useless. (3) That they may serve His Majesty in Parliament, for bettering his revenue, and crushing and securing the seditions in all places.

"6. They desire to be Sheriffs and Justices of the Peace, &c., for the ends and purposes aforesaid; and to have the power of the civil and ordinary militia.

"7. They also desire to be formed into a militia, and to be admitted to be of the ordinary army.

"8. That their religion is consonant to monarchy and implicit obedience. That they themselves have actually served His Majesty in difficulties. That they have no other way to advantage themselves than by a strict adherence to the King. That they have no other refuge; whereas many of His Majesty's subjects do lean hard another way.

"9. That the Roman Catholicks are six to one of all others; that of the said one to six, some are Atheists and Neuters, who will profess the Roman Catholick religion; others devoutly given will affect the same course, that the rest may have their liberty of conscience and may be corrected in case they abuse it.

"10. That the Roman Catholicks having the full power of the nation, they can at all times spare His Majesty an army of sixty thousand men, there being twelve hundred thousand souls in Ireland; and so consequently an hundred and fifty thousand between sixteen and sixty years old: which forces, if allowed to trade, shall have shipping to transport themselves when His Majesty pleaseth.

"11. That they have a good correspondence abroad, for that great numbers of their nation are soldiers, priests, and merchants, in esteem with several great princes and their ministers.

"12. That the toleration of the Roman Catholicks in England being granted, and the insolence of the Hollanders taken down, a confederacy with France which can influence England, as Scotland can also, will together, by God's blessing, make His Majesty's monarchy absolute and real.

"13. That if any of the Irish cannot have their lands *in specie*, but money in lieu, as aforesaid, some of them may transport themselves into America, possibly near New England, to check the growing independence of that country.

"14. That the next Parliament being formed as aforesaid, great sums of money will be given His Majesty. Query, Whether the Roman Catholick clergy may not be admitted into the House of Peers this next Parliament, or stay a little?

"15. That for effecting the premises 'tis better His Majesty should govern Ireland by a committee of such of his Privy Council as approved the conjunction with France and as are not concerned in Ireland, rather than by the Council of Ireland.

"16. Let such a Lord Lieutenant be in Ireland who in inclination, and for the fear of being displaced, will begin this work of laying the foundation of His Majesty's monarchy and hazard his concernments upon that account.

"17. That the army be gradually reformed, and opportunity taken to displace men not affected to this settlement; and to put into the army or garrisons in Ireland some fit persons to begin this work; and likewise judges upon the benches.

"18. Query, What precedents may be found to break the several farms, and to be master of the Exchequer, and pole [pool] the gains of the bankers, brewers, and farmers?"

There follow, under eight sub-heads, various questions connected with the last, the most important of which demands whether the reservation to the King alone of all grants of charters, offices and commands would not "create a closer adherence to the person of the prince and so make monarchy more absolute and real, instead of factious dependences of great men, who are often acted more by self-interest than the advantage of their master."

APPENDIX D

TYRCONNEL'S INSTRUCTIONS IN IRELAND

DALTON, in his *King James's Irish Army List*, I., 53-5, gives, from the original document in the possession of Lord Talbot de Malahide, the Instructions to Tyrconnel on his appointment to the government of Ireland, signed by Sunderland and dated January 10th, 1686/7. As Dalton's work is now scarce, I reproduce them here, in an abbreviated form, for purposes of reference:

"Having, upon serious consultations for the peace, prosperity, and good government of Our Kingdom of Ireland, made choice of you for effecting these ends, as a person of approved loyalty, wisdom, courage, moderation, and integrity, to represent Our Royal person there, and caused Letters patent to be passed therefor, We doubt not but you will pursue all prudent courses for the good government and increase of the profits of the same; and for the better enabling you so to do, We give full power and authority unto you to keep the peace, the laws, and commendable customs of Our said Kingdom, to govern all Our people there, to chastise and correct offenders, and to countenance and encourage such as shall do well; and We do also think fit to prescribe unto you some things which will be necessary for you to observe in your government; and therefore *We do direct and enjoin you forthwith to inform yourself of the present state of that Kingdom*, in all parts thereof, and what is therein amiss, and by what means the same may be best provided for, *and thereof transmit an account*," etc.

It is next directed that *the spiritual livings in the gift of the Crown shall, as they become void, be filled with orthodox persons*, and that Church livings and dignities shall be duly valued.

"We do well know," the King continues, "how much it concerns the happiness of Our subjects, as well as the reputation of Our Government, that there be *an equal and impartial administration of justice in Our ordinary Courts*, and therefore it must be your particular care to enquire diligently into the same," etc.

"Our intention and pleasure being that no additional charge be made to the establishment for that Our Kingdom; but that the surplusage of Our Revenue be laid up in Our Exchequer there, to be disposed as We shall from time to time direct, the first disbursements to be for the use of the Army." "Then you shall, as soon as conveniently may be after your arrival, order an exact muster to be taken of all Our forces there, so that it may appear if each regiment, company, or troop be effectually of the number it ought to be and which We allow upon the pay-rolls: . . . and *you shall then and there cause the following oath, and no other, to be administered* to all officers and soldiers of the Army, and to all governors of towns, forts, and castles; and such of them as shall refuse the said oath, you are to cashier and dismiss the service." Then follows a simple form of oath, to be true and faithful to the King, his heirs and successors, and to be obedient to his Lieutenant-General, and to the superior officers of the particular department; obeying all orders, and submitting to all such rules and articles of war as are or shall be established by His Majesty.

Other instructions deal with the musters, quarters, and discipline of the troops, the Lord Deputy being authorised to cashier all officers sending, receiving, or delivering challenges to a duel or affronting one another.

An early survey and report is prescribed as to the state of castles, forts, magazines, military stores, and trains of artillery; and it is directed that an endeavour be made to erect and set up the art of making saltpetre in Ireland.

"You shall in all things endeavour to improve and advance the trade, so far as it may consist with the laws made and in force for the welfare and benefit of commerce in Our Kingdom of England, and more specially with those which relate to Our Foreign Plantations. And We particularly recommend to you the improvement of the fishery trade and the linen manufacture, and to regulate the defects in the packing and curing of beef. You shall give all lawful encouragement to all strangers resorting unto that Our Kingdom," etc. Renewed care is prescribed to prevent the transportation of wool to any parts beyond the seas and the general abuse committed in Ireland by the unlawful coining of small money for change.

No particular complaints of injustice or oppression against the Lord Deputy shall be entertained, "unless it appear that the party has first made his address" to him. The places in the chief governor's gift are left freely to his absolute disposal. No patent for granting lands, money, or for releasing or abating rents, shall be passed in England without acquainting him. Licenses of absence are left at his discretion. The sale of offices or grants thereof in reversion is prohibited.

The Instructions conclude: "Having directed your predecessor in that government to give orders for disarming all disaffected or suspected persons there and to require the sheriffs of the several counties to give in an account what arms there were in each and in whose hands, and to give order also that the arms which have been bought up by the several counties, or were in the

hands of the militia, should be brought into Our stores; Our pleasure is that you inform yourself what has been done in pursuance of these directions and give such further order as shall be requisite for having the same effectually executed. *You are further to give order that the arms which were taken from our Catholic subjects in the year* 1678, *upon Oats' pretended discovery of a plot, be forthwith restored to them; and, Our intention being that they should be in the same capacity with Our other subjects of being sheriffs, justices of the peace, etc., as they were heretofore, and that they should be admitted to all the privileges and freedoms which Our other subjects enjoy in all ports and corporations, you are to take care thereof accordingly*, and give orders therein from time to time as shall be requisite."

The italicized passages above indicate some of the special directions in which Tyrconnel's activity manifested itself, however little to the satisfaction of his critics. The italics, of course, are not in the original document.

APPENDIX E

IRELAND IN JANUARY, 1689

THE following copy of a letter from Tyrconnel to James II., dated January 29th (old style), 1689, is among the British Museum Additional MSS. (No. 28,053, Leeds Papers, *f.* 432):

"By our letters from England, Sir, which constantly come hither as formerly, I have had from time to time the particulars of your Ma^tys^ deliverance out of the hands of your Enemyes, to the unspeakable Joy of all good men and this your Kingdom. I have been ever since in great disquiet not to have heard one word from your Majesty untill the arrival of Monsr Pontys, which at first gave me great expectations of considerable summs from thence, but y^r^ Ma^tys^ and My Lord Melfords Letters did much surprise me, for I find his great business here was to know the State and Condition of this Kingdome, of which I thought your Ma^ty^ very well informed, by my continuall applications and care to inform you of every particular relateing to Itt, ever since y^r^ accession to the Crown; However since I see Itt out of y^r^ Ma^tys^ Memory, I have in answer to your Ma^tys^ Instructions sent my Lord Melford an answer to every Article of them which comprehends the condition of this Kingdome.

"I find by what I can gather by Monsr Pontys Discourse that the King his Master is well enough dispos'd to succour us with arms and ammunition, but I find him very indifferent upon that Article which most concerns us, and of which wee stand in greatest need, which is mony, and without which this Kingdom must be infallibly lost. True it is that with arms and ammunition I may assemble a considerable Body of naked men together without clothes, but having no mony to subsist, all the order and care I can take will not hinder the ruin of the Country, nor a famine before midsummer.

"Your Ma^ty^ cannot be ignorant how the Citty of London hath already furnished the Prince of Orange with 300,000*l.* Sterling for the reduction of this Kingdome, with Promise of as much more Money as he shall need for

that service. His troops are now marching towards Chester, Liverpole, and Bristoll, and they will certainly be supplied with all those necessaries which wee want. I doe avow, Sir, I have been as much deceived in the hopes with which hitherto I have flattered myself; that the King of France would spare nothing to preserve a Catholique Country, by which he, as well as yr Maty, might very well count upon great advantages in some reasonable time.

"If, Sir, yr Maty will in person come hither and bring with you those succours necessary to support this country, which may not exceed the present allowance given you there (which, as I hear, is 200,000 livres a month) with arms, ammunition and some officers (a particular whereof is here enclosed as well as to My Lord Melford), I will be responsible to you that you shall entirely be the master of this Kingdom and of everything in Itt; and, Sir, I begg of you to consider whither you can with honour continue where you are when you may possess a Kingdom of your own plentifull of all things for human life. And because there are a multitude of reasons which are too tedious on that subject to write, I have desir'd Monsr Pontys to explaine them to your Maty, having acquainted him with the whole state of this Kingdome, and whom I find soe much in your interests as I am absolutely persuaded he will use his utmost skill and Industry to serve you.

"I shall very soone make a bolde stroke for your service, which will prove of the last good or Ill consequence, of which he will fully inform your Maty.

"I will conclude this letter, Sir, by conjuring your Maty to consider the condition of this Kingdome, and by seriously reflecting upon what I have humbly offer'd to determine the fate of this poor loyall People, if wee cannot be supplyed to order such course for their preservation as your Goodness and Mercy will move you for their security in these dismall circumstances.

"In obedience to yr Matys Commands I humbly represent to you the state of your Kingdome of Ireland in the following Answers, given to the severall Articles of your Matys Instructions.

"1. Your Matys Kingdome of Ireland is divided into 4 Provinces, viz. Leinster, Munster, Connaught, and Ulster. The Catholiques of the Citty of Dublin in Leinster may be guessed to equall in number all other Religions there (not including the soldiers, who are all Catholiques). The Catholiques in the rest of that Province are 40 to one of the people of all other Persuasions. The Catholique inhabitants of the Province of Munster are thought to be 40 to one of all other Persuasions. In the Province of Connaught the Catholiques are 200 to one of all other Persuasions. The Catholiques of Ulster are not soe considerable, by reason of the greater number of Scotch Presbyterians there, yett may be thought to be as many as all the Rest. The said 4 Provinces contain 32 Counties or Shires well planted and inhabited by a numerous people not easily reckon'd; all the Catholiques are unanimous and

most zealously affected to your Maᵗʸˢ service, but amongst the Protestants, generally tainted with the Principles of England, there are not in the whole Kingdome one hundred that may be relyed on to serve your Maᵗʸ.

"As to the Army

"2. There are 4 Regiments of Old Troopes, and one Battalion of the Regiment of Guards and 3 Regiments of Horse with one Troop of Granadiers on Horseback.

"I have lately given out Commissions for neare 40 Regiments of Foot, 4 Regimᵗˢ of Dragoons, and two of horse, all which amount to neare 40,000 men, who are all uncloathed and the greatest part unarmed, and are to be subsisted by their severall officers untill the last of Febʳʸ next out of their owne purses, to the ruin of most of them; but after that day I see noe possibility for arming them, clothing them or subsisting them for the future but abandoning the Country to them: but after all if I may be supplied by the last of March with those succours that are necessary which I press in my letters, I doubt not but I shall preserve this Kingdome entirely for yʳ Maᵗʸ."

* * * * * * *

[The missing portion of the original MS. is stated to have contained a list, apparently of forts and harbours, of which only the end remains and is here omitted.]

"3. The present state of the Revenue is humbly represented to your Maᵗʸ in the paper hereunto annex'd.

"4. I have already sent My Lord Mountjoy and Lord Chief Baron Rice to your Maᵗʸ, who will inform you att large of all our Wants, and what may supply us.

"5. I will obey your Maᵗʸ in that article.

"6. As to your protestant subjects here, the most considerable of them as well Peers as Commons, are now in England, solliciting the Prince of Orange to invade this Kingdome, many of them having taken commissions from him and have sent his commissions to severall Protestants here. That the Lord Kingston, Lord Mount Alexander, Lᵈ Blany with severall other their Protestant adherents are now in actuall rebellion in the County of Sligo, and in severall other parts of Ulster. That knowing yʳ Maᵗʸˢ pious care of your Protestants * * * and have been very tender of them, and have of late by Proclamation assur'd those in rebellion of your Maᵗʸˢ free pardon if they forthwith return to their allegiance, to which I feare at this juncture they will be hardly persuaded.

"7. I will carefully observe your Maᵗʸˢ instruction in this article as farr as I am able.

"8. I have rais'd 35 or 36,000 men but without arms to defend them cloaths to cloath them, or money to subsist them, or any visible way to

maintaine them, unlesse by letting them live on the spoyles of the People, which in six months time will destroy both nation and army.

"9. I will doe therein what shall be of best advantage to y^r Ma^{tys} service all which is most humbly submitted to your Ma^{ty}.

TYRCONNELL."

(Addition.)

"To advance before the middle of March att farthest 500,000 crowns in cash, which with our own Industry shall serve us for a yeare.

"To send me besides the 8,000 fire arms already sent 6,000 Matchlocks more and 6,000 firelocks.

"To send me att least 1,200 swords.

"To send me 2,000 Carbines and as many cases of pistolls and holsters.

"To send me a good number of officers to traine."

* * * * * * *

(An addition to the letter of the 29th to the King.)

"Just now the English Letters are come in, being the Confirmation of the great Preparations amaking there against us. If the Succours intended for us here doe not come out of hand, we shall be reduced to great streights, for delay is Destruction at this time, for if I could but procure now 10,000*l.* to march about 6,000 Men to disarme and unhorse your Enemies, I could soone after master this Kingdom, but the want of that Summ will, I feare, hinder Itt; however I will trye to do Itt, as soone as I can bring a few Men together. By this your Ma^{ty} sees the miserable condition of this place, when I cannot raise such a summ upon the Creditt of your Ma^{tys} whole Revenue and my whole Estate. Mony must be sent out of hand, Sir, or all is lost. If you come not y^r Selfe (which I hope you will) money, and all those other things must come incessantly, and all the officers you can send. Pray send away all those that went out of England into France hither out of hand, and Lett some small Frigatt from Brest or St. Malo's transport them, for I want Officers as much as Mony. For my part I could wish Gallway and Waterford or any other ports of this Kingdome were putt into the King of France's hands for the Security of repaying him his money which he shall expend upon us, by which meanes he may be the more willing to supply us, and may fortify those Places upon his owne Charge and keep them. This, Sir, I humbly offer, but my fears are *you* will not be att that Expence. Pray consider, Sir, if you had not better give him those Places untill he is repaid his Mony then suffer the Prince of Or. to take those and the Rest of the Kingdome, which will follow if wee be not immediately supplied; but if your Selfe could land here before y^r Enemys, this whole Kingdome, as one man, will submitt to you, or wee should in one Months time reduce them. God of his Mercy inspire you for his Glory, your owne and y^r Peoples Good.

"Wee cannot live without 3 or 4 Light Frigatts upon this Coast, which I will find all Sorts of Provision for, but Mony I have none for them, nor for the French officers they shall send us from thence. Lett them be advanced six months Pay. Remember, Sir, 500,000 Crowns in mony must be sent, and all things else in the Memoire, and that Delay is Destruction to this Kingdome and that the 200000 Livres a Month which you are allowed there applied to this Kingdome will support your Selfe and Itt against all y^r^ Enemies. A good Lieut^t^ Gen^ll^ for the foot and a good Maj^r^ Gen^ll^ must be sent, Sir."

APPENDIX F

JOHN STEVENS'S ACCOUNT OF THE BOYNE

THE following extracts are taken from the manuscript *Journall of my Travels since the Revolution* in the British Museum (Additional MSS., 36,298, *ff.* 79-82) :—

"Saturday the 28th we marched again about 5 miles & encamped within 3 of Droghedah near a small village along cornfields, gardens, & meadows, the river Boyne in the rear. This night no word was given, but about midnight in a great hurry ammunition delivered out, then orders to take down all tents and send away the baggage. This done the whole army drew out without beat of drum & stood at their armes the whole night expecting the approach of the enemy.

"Sunday the 29th about break of day no enemy appearing, the army began to march in two columns, the one through Droghedagh, the other over the river at Old Bridge & encamped again in two lines in very good order on the south side of the Boyne, between 2 & 3 miles from Droghedagh, the river running along the whole front, the design being to make good the passes of it against the enemy, who were too strong to be engaged in plain feild, till we were reinforced, or they obliged to fight at disadvantage, it being very easy to keep the passes of the river, & the rebels being in some distress for want of provisions, but no human policies are sufficient to stop the course of fate.

"Monday the 30th early in the morning the enemy appeared on the tops of the hills beyond the river, some of the poore country people flying before them. They marched down and spread themselves along the sides of the hills where they encamped, but so as we could not discover them all, a great part being covered by the higher grounds. Part of our cannon was carryed down & planted on the pass, or ford, which from thence played on some regiments of theirs, & did some but not considerable execution. After noon they began to play upon us with their cannon & some morters, but no considerable dammage was received on either side.

"Tuesday the 1st of July very early the tents were thrown down, the baggage sent away, but the souldiers ordered to carry their tents, some of which were afterwards togather with their knapsacks layd in heaps in the feilds with some few centinels, the rest thrown about as they marched, but in conclusion as the fortune of the day was all lost. We had this morning received advice that the enemy marching by night had beaten off a regiment of our dragoons that guarded the bridge of Slane and possessed themselves of it, & now we saw them marching off from their right towards it. We on the other side marched from the left, the river being between both for a considerable space we marched under the enemies cannon, which they played furiously without any intermission, yet did but little execution. We continued marching along the river till comming in sight of the enemy who had passed it & were drawing up, we marched off to the left as well to leave ground for them that followed to draw up, as to extend our line equall with theirs, & finding them still stretching out towards their right we held on our march to the left. Being thus still in expectation of advancing to engage, news was brought us that the enemy having endeavoured to gain the pass we had left behind, were repulsed with considerable loss on both sides, the Ld Dungan a Coll. of Dragoons & many brave men of ours being killed. This latter part was true, the former so far from it that they gained the ford having done much execution on some of our foot that at first opposed them & quite broke such of our horse as came to rescue the foot, in which action the horse guards & Coll. Parker's regiment of horse behaved themselves with unspeakable bravery, but not being seconded & overpowred by the enemy after having done what men could do they were forced to save their remains by flight, which proved fatall to the foot. For the horse in generall taking their flight towards the left broke the whole line of the foot riding over all our battalions. The Ld Grand Priors, wherein I served, was then in Dulike lane enclosed with high banks marching so in rank, the horse came on so unexpected & with such speed some firing their pistols, that we had no time to receive or shun them, but all supposing them to be the enemy (as indeed they were no better to us) took to their heels, no officers being able to stop the men even after they were broke, & the horse past; though at the same time no enemy was near us, or them that fled in such hast to our destruction. This I can affirm having stayed in the rear till all the horse were past, & looking about I wondered what madness possessed our men to run so violently no body pursuing them. What few men I could see I called to, no commands being of force, begging them to stand together & repair to their colours, the danger being in dispersing, but all in vain, some throwing away their arms, others even their coats & shooes to run the lighter. [An obliterated passage of 9 lines follows here.] The first cause I had to suspect the rout at the ford was that the Duke of Berwick, whose command was with the horse came to us & discovering a party of horse at a distance, thinking they were the enemy, commanded our musketiers to line the side of the bank over which they appeared, till finding they were our own men,

we continued our march. This first made me apprehend all was not well & was soon confirmed hearing it whispered among the feild officers, but in conclusion what I have before related put us all beyond doubt. I shall not presume to write all the particulers of this unfortunate day's transactions, the confusion being such that few can pretend to do it. I will therefore proceed to what followed as far as I can assert for truth. I thought the calamity had not been so generall till viewing the hills about us I perceived them covered with souldiers of severall regiments all scattered like sheep flying before the wolfe but so thick they seemed to cover the sides & tops of the hill. The shame of our regiments dishonor only afflicted me before; but now all the horror of a routed army just before so vigorous & desirous of battle & broke without scarce a stroke from the enemy, so perplexed my soul that I envied the few dead, & only grieved I lived to be a spectator of so dismall & lamentable a tragedy. Scarce a regiment was left, but what was reduced to a very inconsiderable number by this, if possible, more than panick fear. Only the French can be said to have rallyed, for only they made head against the enemy & a most honourable retreat, bringing off their cannon, & marching in very good order after sustaining the shock of the enemy, who thereupon made a halt, not only to the honour of the French but the preservation of the rest of the scattered army. Nor ought any part of this glory to be attributed to the Count de Lausun, or La Hougette, who at first left their men, but only to the valour & conduct of Mons[r] Sorlobe, Coll. of the Blew regiment, who with unparalleled bravery headed & brought off his men, whereas the other two fled & more especially Houguette was in such a consternation that the next day when he was above 30 miles from the enemy he caused a bridge to be broke for fear of pursuit, though at the same time the river was passable for foot both above and below the said bridge, so great is the infatuation of a coward when no danger is near but what his weak imagination suggests. . . .

"This day's flight was attended with all the fear and confusion that may be imagined in men surrounded with the greatest of dangers, though ours through the Providence of God & valour of the French had none to pursue or offend them. For the enemy finding the French stand & some of our horse to make head never pursued their victory, or improved their advantage, which if they had done a small party might have cut us off, so that none had been left to make head again & but few of those present to lament the misfortune of the day."

The two following passages occur in the course of Stevens's comments on the battle (*f.* 83):—

"It is agreed on all hands the action at the Ford was ill managed. . . . What is allowed by all is that there was not a sufficient number of foot left to maintain it, & even most of those that were came down too late, and as was said before the horse were put to repulse the enemies foot who had before possessed themselves of the ditches."

"It was certainly an unparallelled fright that caused our own horse to ride

over the greatest part of our first line of foot & break 10 or 12 of our battalions firing upon them as enemies & yet I must confess some of these were the men that with great bravery had sustained the shock of the enemies horse, & were outdone by numbers not by valour, I mean Coll. Parker's regiment. There is no place of excuse for the Dragoons, especially the Earle of Clare's . . . who were the first that fled having scarce seen the enemy, & that with such precipitation that severall of them carried the news next day to Limerick & some not thinking themselves safe there with the same speed into the remotest parts of the County of Clare their native soile, being above 100 miles from the Boyne. Neither does the baseness of the foot appear less notorious, for some regiments being broke by our own horse, others though untoucht took the flight for company, & neither the one nor the other could ever be prevailed with to make head against the enemy & second the French (who were in danger to be cut off) nor so much as to form their battalions & march off with their colours in good order."

INDEX

INDEX

Abercorn, Claud Hamilton, 5th Earl of, 555.
Abercorn, James Hamilton, 1st Earl of, 145.
d'Adda, Count Ferdinando, 376.
"Adventurers," The, 118–21, 125, 183.
Ailesbury, Thomas Bruce, Earl of, 378, 393, 620.
Albemarle, Duke of, *see* Monk, George.
Albeville, Ignatius Maximilian White, Marquis of, 358.
Alexander VII., Pope, 77.
Alexander VIII., Pope, 463.
Allen, James, 175, 182.
Almond, Lady, *see* Montecucoli, Vittoria.
Anglesey, Arthur Annesley, Earl of, 138, 239, 272.
Anne, Princess, 307 *n.*, 376, 379–80, 393–4, 575, 579, 581, 607, 620.
Anselm, Messire, 20 *n.*, 568 *n.*
Arlington, Lord, *see* Bennet, Henry.
Armorer, Nicholas, 53, 138, 212, 230 *n.*
Arran, Richard Butler, Earl of, 98, 124, 144, 271, 283, 293, 304, 369.
Arran, James Hamilton, Earl of, 145.
Arundel of Wardour, Lord, 152, 264, 341, 346.
Ashley, Lord, *see* Cooper, Anthony Ashley.
Aston, Sir Arthur, 28.
Athlone, 30 *n.*, 548–9, 552.
Aughrim, The Battle of, 553.
Aungier, Francis, Lord, afterwards Earl of Longford, 235, 246 *n.*, 626.
d'Avaux, Comte, 389, 425, 429, 432, 433–5, 442, 443–4, 452, 454, 457, 460, 461, 465, 472, 478, 482, 626.
Bacon, Francis, 20.
Baillie Hamilton, Lady, 599, 600, 601, 604.
Bampfield, Colonel, 82 *n.*, 598.
Bantry, Countess of, *see* Jennings, Frances.
Barillon, Paul (Marquis de Branges), 261, 262, 279–80, 295, 308, 309, 346, 356, 358, 359.
Barnewall, Lord, 234.
Belke, Count, 578–9, 580.
Bellasyse, Lord, 264, 341, 343, 618.
Bennet, Henry, afterwards Earl of Arlington, 83, 89, 131, 133–4, 135, 175 *n.*, 208, 212, 222, 223, 225, 238, 245, 261, 605.
Berkeley, Charles, afterwards Viscount Fitzharding and Earl of Falmouth, 82–3, 86, 90–1, 97–9, 102, 104, 106–8, 111, 133, 152, 196, 200.
Berkeley of Stratton, John, Baron, 82–3, 90–1, 104, 106, 175 *n.*, 181, 216 *n.*, 217, 229–33, 247, 250, 291.
Berkeley of Stratton, Lady, 216.
Berny, Louis, Marquis de, 190–5.
Berwick, Duke of, *see* Fitzjames, James.
Blague, Mary, 159, 167; and her sisters Henrietta Maria and Margaret, 196 *n.*
Blanquefort, Lord, *see* Duras, Louis de.
Blood, Colonel, 237.
Boisseleau, Major-General, 514, 518, 630.
Bonrepos, François d'Usson, 357–61, 391, 621.
Boulger, Mr. D. C., 455 *n.*, 625.
Boyer, Abel, 366–8.
Boyle, Michael, Archbishop of Armagh, 296, 310, 311 *n.*, 323, 615.

Boynton, Isabella, afterwards Countess of Roscommon, 163, 256, 258, 328 *n.*, 378 *n.*
Boynton, Katherine, 163–5, 193–4, 199, 205–6, 240–1, 266, 585, 605.
Boynton, Colonel Matthew, 163, 605.
Bristol, George Digby, Earl of, 79 *n.*, 80, 89.
Broghill, Lord, *see* Orrery, Earl of.
Brounker, Henry, afterwards 3rd Viscount, 187–8, 224, 603.
Brounker, William, 2nd Viscount, 91, 603.
Brounker family, 3–4, 603.
Buckingham, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of, 144, 223, 225, 230, 231, 237, 239, 245, 247 *n.*
Bulkeley, Lady Sophia, 572–3, 612.
Burnet, Bishop, 113–4, 185, 364, 371, 376–7, 381 *n.*, 604, 619.
Butler, Richard, 270, 611, 617.
Butler family, *see* Arran, Mountgarret, Ormonde, Ossory.

Campana de Cavelli, Marquise, 426.
Cannon, Colonel Alexander, 385 *n.*
Cardenas, Don Alonso de, 52, 74.
Carlingford, Lord, *see* Taaffe, Theobald, Lord.
Carlyle, Mr. E. I., 557.
Carnegie, *see* Southesk.
Carte, Thomas, 19, 21, 23 *n.*, 31, 84, 91, 123–7, 131, 133, 176 *ff.*, 225 *ff.*, 286, 290–1, 593, 596, 599, 612.
Carton, 22, 62, 323, 332, 441.
Cartwright, Thomas, Bishop of Chester, 425–6.
Castlemaine, Barbara (Villiers), Countess of, 9, 114, 129–31, 157, 168, 200, 201, 223, 225, 229, 230, 231, 237, 244–7, 369.
Castlemaine, Roger Palmer, Earl of, 341.
Catherine (of Braganza), Queen, 90 *n.*, 128, 129–31, 163.
Charles I., King, 8, 23, 25, 26, 27, 33.
Charles II., King, 8, 27, 29, 38 *ff.*, 51, 60, 74, 87, 90, 94, 103, 105, 118, 125, 138, 162, 170, 176–9, 194, 201, 202, 205, 210, 214, 226, 245, 247, 253, 259–64, 265, 273, 282–3, 289, 294, 618; his attitude toward assassination schemes, 41–3, 46; his relations with his brother James, 81–3, 85, 102; with Richard Talbot, 41, 127, 176–8; his Irish policy, 30, 33, 117 *ff.*, 182–3, 211, 238–9, 252–4, 289, 318.
Charlotte, Princess, 376.
Château Renaud, Admiral, 442.
Chesterfield, Philip Stanhope, 2nd Earl of, 41 *n.*, 601.
Chiffinch, William, 308.
Churchill, Arabella, 159, 343, 613.
Churchill, John, afterwards Duke of Marlborough, 1, 5 *n.*, 9, 13, 308, 379, 381, 390, 393, 462, 538, 540, 541, 576–82, 621.
Churchill, Sir John, 5 *n.*
Churchill, Sir Winston, 5 *n.*, 128, 183.
Churchill, Lady, *see* Sarah Jennings.
Churchill, Manor of, 4, 5.
Clancarty, Lord, *see* Muskerry, Viscount.
Clanmalier, Viscount, 133, 135, 235 *n.*
Clanricarde, Richard Burke, 8th Earl of, 557.
Clanricarde, Ulick Burke, 5th Earl and 1st Marquis of, 30.
Clare, Charles O'Brien, 5th Viscount, 573.
Clare, Daniel O'Brien, 3rd Viscount, 464.
Clarendon, 1st Earl of, *see* Hyde, Sir Edward.
Clarendon, Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of, 117 *n.*, 164 *n.*, 298–9, 300 *ff.*, 313 *n.*, 314, 316 *ff.*, 339, 340, 347–52, 363; letters of, 301, 305, 310, 312, 316 *ff.*, 339 *n.*, 344, 348, 360 *n.*, 614, 615, 616; *Diary*, 300, 348 *ff.*, 405.
Clarke, Rev. J. S., 86 *n.*, 480 *n.*, 488, 501, 560 *n.*
Cleveland, Duchess of, *see* Castlemaine, Countess of.
Coleman, Edward, 260, 263–4, 266, 271.
Cologne, Maximilian Henry, Bishop-Elector of, 39, 53.
Colvil, Sir Robert, 401.
Colvile, Mrs. Arthur, 3, 593.
Cominges, Comte de, 112, 153, 190, 192–3, 195, 206, 599.
Condé, Louis de Bourbon, Prince of, 37, 76, 216, 467.
"Confederates," The, 23 *ff.*
Connell, Lieutenant-Colonel, 510, 550.
Conway, Viscount, 253, 270.

Cooper, Anthony Ashley, afterwards Earl of Shaftesbury, 102, 239, 245.
Cornbury, *see* Clarendon, Henry Hyde, 2nd Earl of.
Cornbury, Lord, son of above, 300.
Cosmo de' Medici, 207.
Courtin, Antoine, 160, 190–5, 214, 259, 462, 463.
Coventry, Henry, 214, 217, 273.
Coventry, William, 81 *n.*, 196 *n.*, 223, 224.
Cromwell, Oliver, 28–9, 38–57, 59, 62, 64, 68, 69, 72, 74, 89, 118, 120, 146, 245, 318, 349, 392, 593.
Culpepper, Elizabeth, afterwards wife of Colonel James Hamilton, 148–9.
Culpepper, John, Lord, 52, 55, 148.
Cunningham, Peter, 601.
Cusack, James, 304, 644.
Cusack, Thomas, 241.

Daly, Dennis, 367, 538, 632.
Dangeau, Marquis de: his *Journal*, 152 *n.*, 374 *n.*, 522 *n.*, 533, 560, 567, 574, 629, 632, 635.
Dartmouth, George Legge, Baron, 327, 339 *n.*, 378 *n.*
Davia, Madame, *see* Montecucoli, Vittoria.
Davia, Marquis, 527.
Dawson, Mrs. Margaret, 377 *n.*, 612, 620.
Dempsey, Colonel, 251, 406.
Denmark, Prince George of, 219.
Desmond, Richard Preston, Earl of, 137 *n.*
De Vic, Sir Henry, 72 *n.*
Digby, Sir Kenelm, 10–11.
Dillon, Henry, afterwards 8th Viscount, 374, 448, 479, 554, 556, 557, 619.
Dillon of Costello-Gallen, Thomas, 7th Viscount, 37, 374, 554.
Dillon, Cary *and* Wentworth, *see* Roscommon.
Done, Major Richard, 405–6.
Dongan, Sir John, 21, 26, 31, 47, 75, 644.
Dongan, Robert, 47–8, 50, 51, 52, 55, 56, 59, 63–6, 73, 77, 78, 167, 644.
Dongan, Sir Walter, 26, 31, 35, 38, 41, 75, 93, 644.
Dongan, Walter, styled Lord Dongan, 311–2, 368, 374, 425, 435, 472–3, 495, 496.
Dongan, William, afterwards Viscount Dongan of Clane and Earl of Limerick, 31, 75, 93, 234, 235, 310, 327, 350, 370, 399, 644.
Dorrington, Colonel, 428, 518, 529.
Dover, Lord, *see* Jermyn, Henry.
Drogheda, 28, 57, 456, 466, 493.
Duleek, 499.
Dundalk, 456, 466–9, 487–9.
Dundee, John Grahame, Viscount, 453–4, 563, 625.
Duras, Louis de, afterwards Earl of Feversham, 202 *n.*, 213, 378 *n.*, 389, 393, 606.

Earle, Dr. John, 51.
Ellis, John, 346, 349, 369, 619.
Ellis, William, 369, 403, 405, 407, 617, 619.
"English Interest," The, 120, 126, 320, 371.
Essex, Arthur Capel, Earl of, 246 *n.*, 250, 251 *n.*, 273, 291.
d'Estrées, Admiral, 249.
Evelyn, John, 215, 249, 255, 338, 375.

Falmouth, Earl of, *see* Berkeley, Charles.
Fea, Mr. Allan, 600, 601.
Feilding, Colonel Robert, 479.
Ferdinand, Emperor, 38, 212.
Feversham, Lord, *see* Duras, Louis de.
Finch, Heneage, afterwards Earl of Nottingham, 239, 541, 570.
Fitton, Sir Alexander, afterwards Baron Gosworth, 350, 562 *n.*
Fitzharding, Viscount, *see* Berkeley, Charles.
Fitzjames, Henry, 343, 428, 472–3, 493.
Fitzjames, James, afterwards Duke of Berwick, 140 *n.*, 343, 427, 428, 441, 442, 475, 496, 499, 519, 520, 529 *ff.*, 537, 538, 541–2, 573; his *Memoirs* quoted, 140 *n.*, 411, 457, 490, 502, 513, 519, 529, 533 *n.*
Fuensaldanha, Alonzo Perez de Vivero, Conde de, 60, 74.

Gabaret, Admiral, 475, 480.
Gascoigne, Sir Bernard, 207, 243.

Geoghegan, Father, 366 *n.*, 406.
Gerard, Charles Lord, 47, 48, 49.
Gerard, Sir Gilbert, 133.
Gifford, Father, 309.
Ginkel, General, 540, 548, 553, 556.
Godolphin, Sir William, 264, 605.
Gormanstown, Lord, 399.
Grafton, Henry Fitzroy, Duke of, 393, 528 *n.*, 620.
Gramont, Comtesse de, *see* Hamilton, Elizabeth.
Gramont, Philibert, Comte de, 101, 112, 152–5, 206, 213, 600, 602, 606; his *Memoirs* quoted, 14, 96 *ff.*, 115–6, 139–40, 153 *ff.*, 160 *ff.*, 179 *n.*, 206, 602.
Granard, Earl of, 273, 296, 398, 402, 626.
Grew, Mr. and Mrs., 113 *n.*, 573, 634.
Griffith, Edward, 219, 642.

Haile, Mr. Martin, 573.
Halifax, George Savile, Marquis of, 390, 410.
Halsall, Edward, 50 *n.*
Halsall, James, 43 *n.*, 47, 48–50, 51, 55–6, 58, 64, 65, 69, 72.
Hamilton, Anne, afterwards Lady Carnegie and Countess of Southesk, 114–6.
Hamilton, Anthony, 96, 112, 116, 145, 150, 166, 204, 206, 281, 344 *n.*, 370, 386, 440–1, 453, 532, 573, 606.
Hamilton, Elizabeth, afterwards Comtesse de Gramont, 143–7, 151–6, 159, 164, 202, 208, 281, 568, 600, 604.
Hamilton, Elizabeth, afterwards Viscountess Rosse, 202, 208, 218–9, 280, 287, 296, 374, 449 *n.*, 583, 586.
Hamilton, Frances, afterwards Viscountess Dillon, 208, 218–9, 287, 374, 448, 449 *n.*, 583, 587.
Hamilton, Sir George (senior), 136, 144 *ff.*, 600.
Hamilton, George, afterwards Count, 147, 148, 150, 151, 153, 156–7, 196, 200 *ff.*, 281–2, 374, 600, 605, 606.
Hamilton, James, 147–51, 153, 200, 203, 208, 600, 604.
Hamilton, Sir James, 53.
Hamilton, John, 150, 204, 205, 440, 554, 631.
Hamilton, Lady (Mary Butler), 144, 145, 149–50.
Hamilton, Mary, afterwards Viscountess Kingsland, 208, 218–9, 287, 374, 583, 587.
Hamilton, Richard, 150, 204, 281, 304–5, 323, 327, 333, 344, 360 *n.*, 385 *n.*, 403–9, 418, 422–3, 433, 440–1, 495, 497, 532, 619, 622–3.
Hamilton, Thomas, 150.
Hamilton, William Douglas, Duke of, 436, 453.
Hawley, Colonel William, 51.
Henderson, Sir John, 45.
Henry, Duke of Gloucester, 86.
Henrietta, Princess, Duchesse d'Orléans, 104 *n.*
Henrietta Maria, Queen, 77, 82, 95, 102, 104–9, 170, 194.
Herbert, Admiral, 442.
Hoffmann, Philip John, 377, 389, 391.
Holywell, 4.
Hopton, Richard, 42, 87.
Howard, Henry, afterwards Duke of Norfolk, 152.
Howard, Lord Thomas, 144, 378 *n.*, 428, 555.
Hyde, Anne, afterwards Duchess of York, 14, 91 *n.*, 95 *ff.*, 166, 167, 171, 191, 192, 196–7, 252, 601, 604.
Hyde, Anne (junior), 293 *n.*
Hyde, Sir Edward, afterwards 1st Earl of Clarendon, 21, 54 *n.*, 55, 60, 61, 72–3, 77, 85, 89, 90, 95 *ff.*, 117 *n.*, 124, 127, 130, 138, 150 *n.*, 177–9, 223, 225, 300–1, 312; letters of, 60, 61, 72, 105, 150, 596, 597, 598; *Continuation* quoted, 41, 61, 85, 94, 101 *ff.*, 117 *n.*, 124 *n.*, 130, 177 *ff.*, 594.
Hyde, Lady (Frances Ailesbury), 95.
Hyde, Frances, *see* Knightley, Lady.
Hyde, Henry *and* Lawrence, *see* Clarendon *and* Rochester.

Ibrackan, Henry O'Brien, Viscount, 246 *n.*, 609.
Innocent XI., Pope, 463.
Ireton, General, 29.

Jacobite Narrative, The, 417–8, 431, 439, 447, 453, 455, 466, 468, 473, 475, 488, 496, 514, 515, 536, 544, 548 *ff.*, 554–5, 559–63, 626, 630.
James I., King, 19, 20, 22, 33, 446.

James, Duke of York, afterwards King James II.: serves in French army, 37; in Flanders, 80–3, 91; his naval experience, 93, 172, 192, 195–6, 249, 598; conduct towards Anne Hyde, 95 *ff.*; unsuccessful courtship of Frances Jennings, 162, 173; fortune in the year 1667, 223; becomes Roman Catholic, 252, 598; refuses Test, 258; his unpopularity, 259, 261; attacked by Oates and goes into exile, 263–4; restored, 288; becomes King, 294; his relations with Catherine Sedley, 307–9, 613; treatment of the younger Clarendon, 327 *n.*, 337–8, 348; his "Western Progress," 355–6; the birth of an heir to, 375; his flouting of public opinion, 375–6; his fall and its causes, 388–94; anxiety for his Protestant subjects, 420 *n.*, 423, 441, 451, 454, 627; lands in Ireland, 425 *ff.*; enters Dublin, 431; his journey to Ulster, 433, 437, 441; consents to Act of Repeal, 443–4; dismisses Melfort, 459, 628; his inaction at Dundalk, 466–7; regard for Lauzun, 476, 484, 629; last campaign, 488 *ff.*; conduct at and after the Boyne, 495, 499–502; parting instructions to Tyrconnel, 514; recalls Berwick, 541; at St. Germain, 573–4; his gullibility, 618; his policy in Ireland, 33, 295, 299 *n.*, 303–4, 317, 319, 340, 347, 354, 356–61, 443–4; his relations with Richard Talbot, 81, 84–6, 94, 113, 128, 177–9, 181, 224, 289, 297, 346–8, 364, 425–6, 528, 534, 544, 546, 598; letters of, 46, 60, 419, 517, 594; his *Memoirs*, 95, 104 *n.*, 306, 341, 425, 432, 443, 466, 467, 480, 488, 499, 530, 534, 539, 544, 545, 547, 549, 558–9, 621, 627.

James Francis Edward, Prince of Wales, 375, 380, 526 *n.*, 576, 579, 580, 587, 589, 620.

Jenkins, Sir Leoline, 281, 283, 284.

Jennings, Barbara, 6, 9 *n.*, 219, 281, 641–2.

Jennings, Francis, afterwards successively Lady Hamilton, Countess of Bantry, and Countess and Duchess of Tyrconnel: her ancestry, 3–5; probable date of birth, 6; upbringing, 13; goes to Court, 13, 14, 159; her looks, 160, 191; characteristics, 160–1, 172, 198; courted by the Duke of York, 162, 173; early relations with Richard Talbot, 163–8; affair with Jermyn, 169–73; her morals unjustly attacked, 173, 184, 189–90, 524; escapade with Goditha Price, 184 *ff.*; affair with de Berny, 190–5; on the "Ride to York," 197–9; marries George Hamilton, 201; bears her first daughter, 202; goes to France, 205; life in Paris, 207 *ff.*; bears two more daughters, 208; visits England in 1675, 215; becomes Roman Catholic, 216, 220; widowed, 217; made a Countess, 218; visits England in 1677, 219; marries Talbot, 280, 568, 634; returns with him from France, 287; at King James's accession, 296; with her husband in Ireland, 316, 323, 331, 336; at St. James's Palace, 373–5; at birth of the Prince of Wales, 375, 378; her alleged avarice, 381 *n.*, 383, 446–9; goes to Ireland, 382; in Dublin in 1689, 446; her enmity with the Melforts, 451, 461–2, 522; accused of plotting, 461–4; her traditional retort to James II. after the Boyne, 499 *n.*; sent by Tyrconnel to France, 522; aids him there, 524–5; her parting with him, 535; a widow again, 567; her life at St. Germain, 568, 572–4; petitions for her estate, 568–72; visits England in 1702, 575; her relations with Marlborough, 576–82; Jacobite agent at Delft, 576–7, 580; leaves the Continent, 581; retires to Ireland, 583; her will, 583, 588; and death, 584.

Jennings, John, 2, 9 *n.*, 208, 219, 641.

Jennings, Sir John I., 3–4, 8, 603.

Jennings, Sir John II., 4, 8.

Jennings, Mrs. (Frances Thornhurst), 3, 4, 8, 9–14, 162, 220, 607, 642 *n.*

Jennings, Ralph, 7, 9 *n.*, 220, 281, 641.

Jennings, Richard, 3–8, 208, 593, 641.
Jennings, Sarah, afterwards Duchess of Marlborough, 1, 2, 7, 11, 12, 13, 220, 249, 378–80, 446, 575, 582–3, 607, 620, 641.
Jennings, Susanna, 6, 7, 9 *n.*, 641.
Jennings family, The, 3–5, 603, 641–2.
Jermyn, Henry, afterwards first Baron and then Earl of Dover, 82–3, 144, 152, 169–73, 197–9, 306, 308, 341, 343, 346, 393–4, 428, 452, 477, 483–4.
Jermyn, Henry, Lord, afterwards Duke of St. Albans, 82, 133, 146, 169, 170.
Jones, Colonel Michael, 26, 27.
Juan, Don, of Austria, 76.

Keating, Sir John, 319, 326, 333–4, 371, 399, 622.
Killigrew, Henry, 98, 111, 144, 187.
King, Dr. William, author of *The State of the Protestants*, 321 *n.*, 330, 353, 355 *n.*, 371, 395 *n.*, 398, 420–2, 443 *n.*, 444, 447, 456, 460 *n.*, 598, 614, 617, 622, 624, 646–8.
Kingsland, Nicholas Barnewall, Viscount, 374, 619.
Kingsland, Viscountess, *see* Hamilton, Mary.
Knightley, Lady (Frances Hyde), 331–2, 615.
Knightley, Sir Thomas, 331 *n.*, 615.

La Houguette, Marquis de, 498, 518, 530.
Lake, Dr. Edward, 262.
Lambert, General John, 56.
Lane, George, afterwards Viscount Lanesborough, 49, 59, 63.
Lang, Mr. Andrew, 112.
Langdale, Marmaduke, Lord, 90–1.
Lart, Mr. C. E., 586.
Lauderdale, John Maitland, Earl and later Duke of, 239, 245.
Lauzun, Antonin Nompar de Caumont, Comte de, 461, 475–9, 483, 485–6, 489, 494, 496, 498, 500, 507, 511–2, 515, 518, 523, 524, 527–8, 543–4, 629, 631.
Leigh, Robert, 240, 241.
Leighton, Sir Ellis, 237, 247–8.
Lely, Sir Peter, 160, 208.
Leslie, Charles, 422–3, 628.
" Levellers," The, 39–40, 44, 60.
Levinge, Sir Richard, 569, 571.
Limerick, 502, 507, 555, 559.
Limerick, Earl of, *see* Dongan, William.
Lionne, Hugues de, 190–5.
Lister, Sir Martin *and* Lady, 3, 5.
Livingstone, Lady Betty, 164 *n.*, 601.
Loftus, Lady (Dorothy Boyle), 608, 644.
Londonderry, 355, 395, 416–7, 441–2, 451–3.
Longford, Lady, 331.
Longford, Lord, *see* Aungier.
Louis XIV., King, 148, 152, 203, 207, 209, 210–2, 280, 282, 357, 390–1, 413–4, 419, 427, 428–30, 438, 444, 463, 476, 480, 483, 486, 517, 526, 528, 556, 568, 574, 579, 588, 600, 619, 632.
Louvois, Marquis de, 428, 450, 451, 454, 478, 480, 484, 524, 527, 532, 540.
Lucan, Lord, *see* Sarsfield, Patrick.
Lundy, Colonel Robert, 417.
Lutterell's Town, 265, 266, 269.
Luttrell, Henry, 510, 513, 521, 529–31, 533, 544, 558, 562, 631.
Luttrell, Narcissus, 295, 346 *n.*, 352, 353, 617, 619.
Luttrell, Simon, 370, 467, 500, 510, 529–30, 544.
Lyttelton, Sir Charles, 248, 575, 588, 598.

Macaulay, Lord, 17–18, 94, 99, 109–13, 139, 189, 222, 297, 302–3, 310, 313 *n.*, 330, 342, 369, 381, 389, 392, 455, 490, 497, 563, 573, 602, 613, 615–6, 618, 622, 626, 632.
MacCarty, Cormac, styled Lord Muskerry, 76, 80, 84–6, 196.
MacCarty, Justin, afterwards Viscount Mount Cashel, 282, 304–5, 327, 332–4, 343, 344, 386, 425, 452, 473–4, 479, 482.
Macdonnell, Colonel Alexander, 537.
Macpherson, Sir James, 96 *n.*, *etc.* *See under* James II., *Memoirs*.
Malahide, 17, 18, 164.
Manley, Mrs., 9–12.
Manning, Henry, 42, 47, 50–5, 59 *n.*, 61, 65, 72.

Marsh, Dr. Francis, Archbishop of Dublin, 408, 409.
Marvell, Andrew, 223–4, 271, 609.
Mary, Princess, 259–62, 288, 376, 569–71, 613.
Mary, Queen (Marie-Beatrice d'Este); marries James, Duke of York, 259; bears her first child, 262; her household as Queen, 296; refuses to receive Catherine Sedley, 309; relations with the Rochesters and Clarendon, 337, 343; opposes Father Petre's appointment to Privy Council, 341; bears Prince James Francis Edward, 375–80; friendship for Lauzun, 476, 629, 631; desire for James's return from Ireland, 501; supports Tyrconnel, 532; her correspondence with him, 469–71, 485 *n.*, 563, 634; at St. Germain, 568, 573, 577.
Massonet, 46.
Masten, William, 49, 50, 58, 65, 72.
Maumont, Lieutenant-General, 429–30, 452.
Maxwell, Colonel Thomas, 530–1, 552, 631.
Maxwell, Father, 462 *n.*, 463.
Mazarin, Cardinal, 38, 75.
Mazarin, Hortensia (Mancini), Duchess of, 344.
Meath, Lord, 398.
Melani, Abbé, 484.
Melfort, John Drummond, Earl and afterwards Duke of, 378 *n.*, 412, 425, 428, 433–5, 450–1, 458–9, 471, 473, 487, 522, 625, 628.
Melfort, Lady, 451, 625.
Mervyn, Sir Audley, 133.
Middleton, Charles, afterwards Earl of Middleton and Monmouth, 378 *n.*, 393.
Middleton, General Sir Thomas, 80.
Middleton, Mrs., 153.
Moloney, John, Roman Catholic Bishop of Killaloe, 251 *n.*, 460 *n.*, 462–4.
Monk, George, afterwards Duke of Albemarle, 14, 118, 127, 228.
Monmouth, James, Duke of, 203, 223, 288, 297.
Montagu, Edward, afterwards Earl of Sandwich, 92, 200, 249, 604.
Montagu, Ralph, 208–10, 604.
Montecucoli, Vittoria, afterwards Countess of Almond, 572–3, 635.
Moore, Patrick, 176 *n.*
Mount Alexander, Hugh Montgomery, Earl of, 175–6, 182.
Mount Cashel, Lord, *see* MacCarty, Justin.
Mountgarret, Richard Butler, Viscount, 234, 264, 270.
Mountjoy, William Stewart, Earl of, 384, 395, 398, 414, 416–8, 473, 530, 624.
Murray, Rev. R. H., 113 *n.*
Muskerry, Donogh MacCarty, Viscount (afterwards Earl of Clancarty), 24, 30 *n.*, 84, 176 *n.*
Muskerry, Lady (Eleanor Butler), 84.

Nagle, Richard, 333–6, 340, 347, 407, 536, 538, 560, 562 *n.*, 615, 616.
Netterville, Alison, *see under* Talbot, Sir William, 1st Baronet.
Netterville, Viscount, 234, 370.
Neuburg, Philip William, Count Palatine of, 53.
Newburgh, James Livingstone, Earl of, 164 *n.*, 601.
Newcomen, Sir Thomas, 304–5, 323, 344, 370, 474, 622, 627.
Newcomen, Lady, *see* Talbot, Frances.
Nicholas, Sir Edward, 42, 52, 60, 73.
Nihill, James, 332–3, 615.
Nolan, Captain James, 243, 246.
Norwich, George Goring, Earl of, 52.
Nottingham, Lord, *see* Finch, Heneage.
Nugent, Sir Robert, 236–7.
Nugent, Thomas, afterwards Baron Riverston, 348–9, 350, 364, 425, 537–8, 617.
Nugent, Colonel William, 400, 622.

Oates, Titus, 257, 258, 263, 266, 270, 274, 285, 365.
O'Brien, Lord, *see* Ibrackan.
O'Callaghan, Mr. J. C., 460 *n.*, 629.
O'Donnell, Hugh (Baldearg), 521, 556–7.
Ogilvie, Captain John, 578–80.
O'Kelly, Charles, 362; his *Macariæ Excidium*, 444, 459 *n.*, 466, 468, 471, 473–4, 482, 486, 502, 511–5, 518, 519–21, 522–5, 529, 532, 536–8, 546, 552, 553, 556, 561, 630.

O'Neil, Sir Brian, 176, 602.
O'Neil, Daniel, 41, 66, 79.
O'Neil, Gordon, 510, 557, 631.
O'Neil, Sir Henry, 18, 644.
O'Neil, Sir Neil, 370, 460, 463, 464, 493, 494, 495, 644.
O'Neil, Owen, 22, 25–9, 41, 77, 145.
Orange, Princess of (Mary, Princess Royal of England), 39, 95, 103, 107–8, 170.
Orange, William Henry, Prince of, *see* William, Prince of Orange.
d'Orléans, Duchesse, *see* Henrietta, Princess.
Ormonde, James Butler, 13th Earl and 1st Duke of, 23–31, 47, 52, 54 *n.*, 55, 60, 63, 66, 73, 74, 80, 103, 121 *ff.*, 135, 138, 146, 147–50, 174 *ff.*, 182, 222, 224–8, 233, 237–9, 242–3, 251 *n.*, 265 *ff.*, 285–6, 289–95, 313, 527–8, 616; his relations with the Talbot family, 26, 36, 54, 59 *ff.*, 78–9, 85–6, 180, 227, 267–8, 271 (*see also under* Talbot, Richard); letters of, 79, 122 *n.*, 147, 233 *n.*, 251 *n.*, 267–8, 268 *n.*, 269–71, 291, 313, 351, 597, 599.
Ormonde, James Butler, 2nd Duke of, 293 *n.*, 396, 402, 613.
Ormonde, Lady (Elizabeth Preston), 105, 137, 146, 256, 290.
Orrery, Roger Boyle, Earl of, 222, 231, 244–5, 607, 608, 644.
Ossory, James Butler, Earl of, 100, 124, 135–7, 139, 174, 176, 261, 270, 293, 369.

Paget, John, 613.
Pale, The, 17, 21–2, 24, 27, 32, 33.
"Papists, Innocent," 119, 126, 132, 139.
Patrick, Father, 255–6.
Pennant, Thomas, 582 *n.*
Pepys, Samuel, 81 *n.*, 85, 116, 128, 161, 165, 185, 187, 189, 196, 201, 225, 247 *n.*, 338, 601, 603, 604.
Perth, James Drummond, Earl of, 436, 450, 626.
Petre, Father Edward, 306, 341, 346, 366, 368, 376.
Phillips, John, 399–400, 409.
Pippard, John, 270.
Plowden, Francis, 562 *n.*
Plunkett, Sir Nicholas, 123, 127–8.
Plunkett, Nicholas, 555, 563 *n.* *See also Jacobite Narrative.*
Plunkett, Oliver, Roman Catholic Bishop of Armagh, 229 *n.*, 251 *n.*, 274.
Pointis, Marquis de, 409, 414, 418–9, 429, 442, 449.
Porter, Sir Charles, 311 *n.*, 328, 332–3.
Powis, William Herbert, Marquis, and afterwards Duke of, 264, 340–1, 343, 347, 364, 428, 618.
Prescott, Henry, 49, 58.
Preston, Richard Graham, Viscount, 281–3, 393.
Preston, Thomas, afterwards Viscount Tara, 25–6.
Price, Goditha, 158, 167–8, 171, 186 *ff.*, 600.
Price, Henrietta Maria, 164 *n.*, 600.
Price, Receiver-General, 332, 615.
Purcell, Captain Nicholas, 529–31, 533, 544, 554.
Pusignan, Lieutenant-General, 429, 442, 452.

Radnor, Lord, *see* Robartes.
Ranelagh, Richard Jones, Viscount, 244–7.
"Remonstrants," The, 232–3.
Repeal, Act of, 444, 520, 627.
Reresby, Sir John, 196, 351, 604.
Reynolds, Commissary-General John, 28, 29.
Rice, Stephen, 333–4, 364, 414, 416–9, 536, 617.
Richmond, Charles Stuart, Duke of, 152.
Rinuccini, Giovanni Battista, 24–5, 27, 32, 36, 123.
Rivers, Sir Richard, 397–8.
Riverston, Lord, *see* Nugent, Thomas.
Rizzini, Abbé, 260, 413 *n.*, 420 *n.*, 571.
Robartes, John, Lord, afterwards Earl of Radnor, 226, 228–9, 294.
Rochester, Lawrence Hyde, Earl of, 289, 293–4, 298, 307, 308, 314, 318, 337–8, 340–1, 347–8.
Rochester, Lady (Henrietta Boyle), 308, 337.
Rochester, Henry Wilmot, Earl of, 47, 74, 80, 184–6, 603.
Rochfort, Robert, 397–8.

Romney, Lord, *see* Sidney, Henry.
Roscommon, Cary Dillon, 5th Earl of, 328–9, 619.
Roscommon, Wentworth Dillon, 4th Earl of, 256, 328 *n.*
Roscommon, Lady, *see* Boynton, Isabella.
Rose, Richard, 47, 49.
Ross, Thomas, 42, 256.
Rosse, Lawrence Parsons, Viscount, 370, 374, 586, 619, 626.
Rosse, Lady, *see* Hamilton, Elizabeth.
Roze, Conrad, Comte de, 429, 432, 442, 452–6, 460, 466, 478, 482, 483 *n.*
Rupert, Prince, 171–2, 178, 239, 601.
Russell, John, 152.
Russell, William, 152.
Ruvigny, Marquis de, 572.

St. Albans, 3 *ff.*, 14, 582–3, 641–2.
St. Albans, Duke of, *see* Jermyn, Henry, Lord.
St. George, Sir Oliver, 408.
Saint-Germain, 567–8, 572–4, 579–80, 586.
Saint-Maurice, Marquis de, 600.
St. Ruth, Marquis de, 479, 532–3, 536 *n.*, 542, 544–54.
Sandridge, 3, 4, 281.
Sandwich, Lord, *see* Montagu, Edward.
Sandwich, Lady, 161, 189–90.
Sarsfield, Patrick, afterwards Earl of Lucan, 133, 385, 428, 483, 512–3, 515, 518, 520, 529, 533–4, 536, 547, 553–4, 558–9, 631, 633.
Savile, Henry, 204, 280, 281.
Schomberg, Frederic, Graf von, 447, 455–6, 467, 474–5, 486, 495, 499.
Schomberg, Meinhart, 494, 495.
Scott, Miss Eva, 596.
Scott, Sir Walter, 11 *n.*
Sedley, Catherine, afterwards Countess of Dorchester, 307–9, 337, 613.
Sedley, Sir Charles, 200, 201 *n.*, 308.
Settlement, Acts of, 241, 251–4, 319–20, 334, 443–4, 618. *See also under* Talbot, Richard.
Sévigné, Madame de, 218.
Sexby, Edward, 40, 61, 73.
Seymour, Sir Edward, 246.
Shelton, Captain, 282–3.
Sheridan, Thomas, 342, 346, 350, 365–9, 615, 617, 618; his manuscript history (*Sheridan MS.*), 18, 342.
Shrewsbury, Francis Talbot, Earl of, 144.
Shrewsbury, Countess of (Anna Maria Brudenel), 143–4.
Sidney, Henry, afterwards Earl of Romney, 187, 197, 569, 604.
Southampton, Thomas Wriothesley, Earl of, 102, 103.
Southesk, James Carnegie, 2nd Earl of, 114–5.
Southesk, Robert Carnegie, 3rd Ear of, 114–5.
Southesk, Lady, *see* Hamilton, Anne.
Southwell, Sir Robert, 122 *n.*, 241 *n.*, 272, 290.
Stafford, William Howard, Viscount, 264.
Stanhope, Catherine, Lady, 41 *n.*, 105, 170.
Steinman, Mr. G. S., 593, 612.
Stephens, Colonel John, 47, 48, 49, 63–6, 69.
Stevens, John, 396, 468; his *Journal*, 396, 439 *n.*, 468, 487 *n.*, 492 *ff.*, 504–6, 508–11, 538, 545 *n.*, 632, 657–60; *and see* Preface.
Stewart, Frances, afterwards Duchess of Richmond, 14, 151, 157, 162, 164 *n.*, 200, 573.
Story, Rev. G. W., 456, 550 *n.*, 634.
Sunderland, Robert Spencer, Earl of, 305, 306–9, 340–2, 346, 347, 358, 359, 364, 368, 390 *n.*, 391, 450, 617, 618, 621.
Sunderland, Countess of (Anne Digby), 105, 307, 378 *n.*
Sussex, Countess of (Anne Palmer), 247.
Swift, Dean, 11–12.

Taaffe, Mr., 248, 500.
Taaffe, Theobald, Lord, afterwards Earl of Carlingford, 87, 133, 244, 247–8.
Talbot, Bruno, 370.
Talbot, Lady Charlotte, 266, 287, 375, 574, 585–6, 588, 611, 636.
Talbot, Charlotte (alleged daughter of Duke and Duchess of Tyrconnel), 287, 375, 587–8, 637.
Talbot, Eleanor, 18, 644.

Talbot, Frances, successively Mrs. Cusack and Lady Newcomen, 304, 305 *n.*, 474 *n.*, 622, 644.
Talbot, Garrett, 22, 298, 644.
Talbot, Gilbert, 22, 59, 61–3, 67, 72, 75–6, 86, 644.
Talbot, James, 22, 644.
Talbot, Colonel James (of Templeogue), 554.
Talbot, Father James, 77–8, 597.
Talbot, John, 22, 176 *n.*, 236, 644.
Talbot, Katherine, 266, 287, 611.
Talbot, Katherine, 1st wife of Richard, *see* Boynton, Katherine.
Talbot, Lieutenant-Colonel Mark, 511, 637.
Talbot, Mary, afterwards Lady Dongan, 21, 26, 47, 644.
Talbot, Father Peter, 22, 36–7, 72, 79, 86, 93, 134 *n.*, 154, 176, 178, 251 *n.*, 599; his intrigues before the Restoration, 40, 43, 60, 74, 82, 89–90, 598; at Whitehall, 129–31; becomes Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, 227; his intrigues in Ireland, 227–33, 240 *n.*, 646–8; persecutes the Remonstrants, 231–3; banished to France, 254–5; in retirement in Cheshire, 257, 265; accused by Oates, 264, 266–7; arrested, 267–9; dies in prison, 274, 291, 611; letters of, 36, 55, 57, 60, 66, 67, 76, 82 *n.*, 93 *n.*
Talbot, Richard, afterwards successively Earl and Duke of Tyrconnel: his ancestry, 17–18, 382–3; birth, 22; serves in Irish Confederate army, 25; wounded and captured, 27; again wounded at Drogheda, 28; escapes to Spain, 29; his early associations, 31 *ff.*; in Madrid, 35; goes to Cologne, 41; plots to kill Cromwell, 47 *ff.*; arrested in London, 50, 595; escapes, 57; reports against, 64 *ff.*; his character vindicated, 72; in Flanders, 75; joins Duke of York's household, 83; quarrels with Cormac MacCarty, 85; "Fighting Dick Talbot," 87–8; returns to England, 92, 94; accused of slandering Anne Hyde, 95 *ff.*, 313 *n.*; other charges against, 113; champions the dispossessed Irish, 123 *ff.*; insults Ormonde and goes to the Tower, 126; on a mission to Portugal, 128; goes to Ireland and makes a fortune, 129, 133–4, 139; his gambling, 139, 179 *n.*; early love affairs, 143–4, 154–6; first meets Frances Jennings and Katherine Boynton, 163; accepted by Frances, 165–6; jilted, 167–8; his work for his Irish clients, 175 *ff.*; insults Ormonde and goes to the Tower again, 176–82; on the "Ride to York," 197–9; goes to Ireland and deals in land there, 221 *ff.*; marries Katherine Boynton, 205–6, 226; his league with Buckingham, Lady Castlemaine, and others, 225, 230–2; carries Irish petition to England, 234, 238; his campaign against the Acts of Settlement, 238–41, 251, 319, 334, 354, 356, 363–4, 443–4, 617–8; attacks Ormonde again, 241–3; intrigues with Orrery, etc., 244 *ff.*; joins the fleet and is captured at Southwold Bay, 248–50; his new mission to England, 251; impeached in Parliament and banished to France, 252–6; in Yorkshire, 257; back in Dublin, 266; loses first wife, 266; accused by Oates and arrested, 264, 270; released, 272; goes to France again, 273, 279; marries Frances Jennings, 280, 568, 634; his alleged connection with Gleson's plot, 281–4; appeals to Ormonde and returns to Ireland, 285–7; reports on changes necessary in Ireland, 289, 292–3; conduct after King James's accession, 296–7; made Earl of Tyrconnel, 297; Clarendon's animus against, 301, 310, 315, 324, 333; goes to England and appointed Irish Lieutenant-General, 301, 304, 310; his compact with Sunderland, etc., 306, 340; returns to Ireland, 313; his relations with Clarendon, 316–38; his reform of the Irish army, 317, 320–30, 384–5; visit to England in 1686, 339; claims Sunderland's fulfilment of compact, 340–2; appointed Lord Deputy, 347; returns to Dublin, 349–52;

his interpretation of his Instructions, 353–5, 371, 649–51; meets James at Chester, 355; his alleged scheme to alienate Ireland to France, 357–62, 368; quarrels with Sheridan, 366–9; his nepotism, 370; prepares to meet Dutch invasion, 385–7, 394 *ff.*, 411 *ff.*; encouraged by Richard Hamilton, 401, 408–9; his conduct to Mountjoy, 416–8, 624; disarms the Protestants, 420–2, 454; meets James at Cork and is made a Duke, 426–7; averse to James's Ulster journey, 433, 437–8; his quarrel with Melfort, 434, 451, 458–9; relations with d'Avaux, 435, 443, 457, 465; his real plans, 437–8; friendship with Richard Hamilton, 440–1, 626; his illness, 441–2, 446, 449, 456; carries repeal of the Settlement, 443–4; returns to activity, 456–7, 465, 491; his advice at Drogheda, 467; appeals for French aid, 469, 474; in the winter of 1689–90, 469–72; various surmises as to his policy, 482–4; his relations with Lauzun, 484, 486; waning influence in Ireland, 487; attitude before the Boyne, 488–90; military qualifications, 490–1; at the Boyne, 495–8; advises James to leave Ireland, 500–2; retreats to Limerick, 502–5; Irish plots against, 508 *ff.*, 528 *ff.*; his proposals for conduct of the war, 509, 511–6; sets up provisional government and sails for France, 518 *ff.*, 523; tricks Lauzun, 524, 527–8; a story of him and Louis XIV., 526 *n.*; his delay at Brest, 528, 533–5; his treatment by James in 1690, 534; returns to Ireland, 536; makes fresh appeals to France, 540, 543, 545; his authority curtailed, 545–6; insulted at Athlone, 549–52, 633; his action after Aughrim, 554–6; last efforts to suppress treason, 557–9; his end, 560–1; his unwavering loyalty, 563–4; letters of, 49, 58, 68–9, 70–2, 129, 134, 135, 136, 285, 385–6, 411–6, 436, 469–71, 481, 652–6; his strong language, 67, 320 *n.*, 355 *n.*, 624; sufferings from gout, 202–3, 313, 321, 325; unfounded charges of inhumanity against, 274–5, 372, 423; concerning his "lying," 322, 329–30, 335, 399 *n.*, 614, 616; alleged to be the "converter" of James II., 598.

Talbot, Richard, illegitimate son of the above, 144, 429, 518 *n.*, 588–9.

Talbot, Richard, afterwards 3rd Earl of Tyrconnel, 574, 585, 589, 636, 644.

Talbot, Richard Francis, afterwards 4th Earl of Tyrconnel, 585–6, 636.

Talbot, Sir Robert, 2nd Baronet, 21, 23–4, 26, 29–31, 79, 93, 124 *n.*, 176 *n.*, 180, 182, 227, 234, 597, 643.

Talbot, Father Thomas, 22, 29, 77–9, 82, 86, 88–9, 130, 176 *n.*, 178, 180, 182, 233 *n.*, 597.

Talbot, Sir William, 1st Baronet, 17–22, 643; his wife (Alison Netterville), 18, 62.

Talbot, Sir William, 3rd Baronet, 234, 271, 298, 370, 643.

Talbot, William, afterwards 2nd Earl of Tyrconnel, 298, 370, 585, 644.

Talbot family, 17–18, 32–3, 56, 144, 643–5.

Talmache, Sir J., 575.

Tara, Viscount, *see* Preston, Thomas.

Temple, Anne, 159, 196 *n.*

Temple, Sir John, 237, 319, 399, 634.

Temple, John, 403–5, 623.

Temple, Sir William, 403.

Tessé, Chevalier de, 544.

Thornhurst, Frances, *see* Jennings, Mrs.

Thurles, Viscount, *see* Ormonde, James Butler, 1st Duke of.

Thurloe, John, 42, 45, 47, 48, 51, 52, 56, 61–3, 72, 80, 88.

Thynne, Lady Isabella, 59, 65.

Trant, Patrick, 314, 614.

Turenne, Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, Vicomte de, 37, 77, 81, 153, 213–4, 467.

Twickenham, 256–7.

Tyrconnel. *See under* Talbot, Richard (2), Richard Francis, *and* William; *and also* 557 *n.*

D'Usson, Marquis, 544, 547, 548, 549, 553, 556, 557, 560.

Ventimiglia, Prince of, 587–8.
Villiers, Barbara, *see* Castlemaine, Countess of.

Waldegrave, Lord, 476.
Walpole, Horace, 582, 584.
Walsh, Peter, 89, 229 *n.*
Wettenhall, Edward, Bishop of Cork, 426, 626.
Whettenhall, Elizabeth, 156–7.
Whitehall, 5–6, 55–7, 161.
William (Henry), Prince of Orange: his first relations with England, 259–60; marries Princess Mary, 261–2; intrigues against James, 288, 361, 377, 381, 389; his character, 391–2; invades England, 392; attempts to win over Tyrconnel and Ireland, 402 *ff.*, 411, 422, 623; proclaimed King at Whitehall, 410; invades Ireland, 486; at the Boyne, 495, 499; advances on Limerick, 514; abandons the siege and leaves Ireland, 517–8; his rewards for traitors, 558; action in Lady Tyrconnel's case, 571–2, 635; death, 575; conduct toward his wife, 613.
Williamson, Sir Joseph, 138, 212, 219, 221–2, 230 *n.*, 244–7, 254.
Wogan, Edward, 48, 56.

York, Duchess of, *see* Hyde, Anne.
York, Duke of, *see* James, Duke of York.
"York, The Ride to," 196–9.

Zurlauben, Colonel, 498–9.

Printed at The Chapel River Press, Kingston, Surrey.

100922